United Nations

A/C.1/61/PV.20

General Assembly

Sixty-first session

Official Records

First Committee

20th meeting

Wednesday, 25 October 2006, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairperson: Mrs. Juul . . . . (Norway)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairperson: The Committee will continue to take action on the remaining draft resolution, which appears in informal working paper No. 1, starting with cluster 3, namely "Outer Space — disarmament aspects".

After completing action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, namely "Conventional weapons", followed by draft resolutions and decisions contained in clusters 5, 6 and 7.

At this stage, I would like to inform the Committee that at the request of the sponsoring delegation, action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4, contained in cluster 7, has been postponed to a later stage of the work of the Committee.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to make two announcements that pertain to the work of the Committee.

First, there are additional texts of oral statements available in room 2977 H of the Secretariat. We currently have all oral statements but one, which will be available shortly. That is the oral statement on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21. Members will find 14 oral statements available in the Secretariat.

Secondly, just to let members know, informal paper No. 2, listing the drafts which are ready for action for our meeting tomorrow, will be circulated shortly today, after the start of our meeting.

The Chairperson: Before the Committee proceeds to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3 of informal working paper No. 1, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement other than explanation of vote, or to introduce the draft resolutions.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): This year the Chinese delegation has joined in co-sponsoring the draft resolution entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities" (A/C.1/61/L.36). Outer space is the common heritage of all humankind. A world without outer space weapons is just as important as a world without weapons of mass destruction. The draft resolution will play an important supplementary role in the drafting and completion of the international legal instrument proposed in document CD/1679, concerning the prohibition of the deployment of weapons in outer space, and the prohibition of the use or the threat of use of force against outer space objects. China has consistently held that achieving a new international legal instrument in order to address shortcomings in the current outer space legal regime is the only effective way to meet the challenge of the weaponization of outer space.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Developing proposals for possible outer space transparency and confidence-building measures is only the first step in achieving that objective. China is of the view that the Conference on Disarmament should, as soon as possible, re-establish its ad hoc committee on outer space in order to carry out substantive work towards the prevention of the weaponization of outer space. China would be happy to work with all States and to make unremitting efforts to achieve that aim.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 3, starting with A/C.1/61/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". Before doing so, I shall call upon those delegations wishing to explain their positions on the draft resolutions in cluster 3.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): Our delegation takes the floor to explain its upcoming votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.10/Rev.1, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space" and L.36, "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". There is no arms race in outer space and no prospect of an arms race in outer space. Thus, there is no arms control problem for an international community to address. There already exists an extensive and comprehensive system for limiting certain uses of outer space. The existing multilateral outer space arms control regime already deals adequately with the non-weaponization of space.

As stated in our national space policy, the United States is committed to the peaceful exploration of space and use of space by all nations for peaceful purposes. Peaceful purposes can include appropriate defence activities in pursuit of national security and other goals. We take seriously our commitment to carry on all United States activities in the exploration and use of outer space in accordance with international law, including the Outer Space Treaty and the United Nations Charter, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international cooperation and understanding.

The United States already has a number of efforts underway to help safeguard and improve peaceful uses of outer space for all, including providing information on objects in space through a public domain website. We have led the way in negotiating guidelines for mitigating the dangers to space operations presented by orbital debris. We also have extended assistance to other spacefaring nations by offering help in collision avoidance. In short, we see no reason for international institutions to address a non-existent arms race in outer space.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". A recorded vote has been requested.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 12th meeting, on 12 October 2006. Sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the draft resolution and in A/C.1/61/CRP.5. In addition, Jordan has become a sponsor.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, Israel.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.36. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.36, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 12th meeting, on 12 October. The sponsors are listed in A/C.1/61/L.36 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1. In addition, Spain has been added to the list of sponsors.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.36 was adopted by 167 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairperson: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their positions or vote after the decision has been taken.

Mr. Denot Medeiros (Brazil): I wish to take this opportunity to explain Brazil's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". Brazil supports the establishment of a substantive programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament, preferably on the basis of the so-called Five Ambassadors proposal. We consider that the proposal contains a balanced approach to the four basic areas of concern to the majority of the Conference membership, namely negative security assurances; nuclear disarmament; the negotiation of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The last issue is the subject of draft resolution L.10/Rev.1, just adopted.

I wish to explain that we lent our support to draft resolution L.10/Rev.1 not only because of its specific content, but also because we are convinced that, in order to restore its credibility, the Conference on Disarmament should begin, as soon as possible, complete negotiations after so many years of inaction and paralysis. Our support for the establishment of an ad hoc committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space should be seen in that context; it should come in parallel to an early political decision on the work programme of the Conference, as well as on possible negotiations on the other items on the agenda of the Conference — especially those I mentioned that are covered in the Five Ambassadors proposal, or variations thereof that might command consensus in Geneva.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", which Japan supported in the voting. Japan's view is that the issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space should be dealt with on the basis of the results of the ongoing discussions in the Conference on Disarmament and without prejudice to those discussions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.18, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.18, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in L.18 and in A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1. In addition, Peru has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.18, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects".

> "In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.18, I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.
>
> "By operative paragraphs 11 and 12 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Eighth Annual Conference of the States Parties to Amended Protocol II on 6 November 2006 and to the Third Review Conference, from 7 to 17 November 2006, and for any possible continuation of work after the Conference, should the States parties deem it appropriate.
>
> "The General Assembly would also request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, to continue to inform the General Assembly periodically, by electronic means, of ratifications and acceptances of and accessions to the Convention, its amended article 1 and the Protocols thereto.
>
> "The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the respective cost estimates for servicing the two conferences of the States parties to be held on

6 and on 7 to 17 November 2006 have been prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the Seventh Annual Conference of the States Parties to Amended Protocol II, held at Geneva on 23 November 2005, and by the Meeting of the States Parties held at Geneva on 24 and 25 November 2005.

"The Secretary-General also wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the costs of the Eighth Annual Conference of the States Parties to Amended Protocol II and the Third Review Conference would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in the two conferences, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.

"The request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide services to the Eighth Annual Conference of the States Parties to Amended Protocol II and the Third Review Conference should thus have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

"Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for any possible continuation of the work after the Conference for the approval of the States parties.

"It is recalled that all activities relating to international conventions or treaties under their respective legal arrangements are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. These activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat after sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties.

"Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.18 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007, the current biennium."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.18 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.40.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.40, entitled "Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms", was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 17th meeting, on 19 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/61/L.40 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: Grenada, Haiti, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Moldova and Senegal.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.40 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 5, on regional disarmament and security.

I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement other than an explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Kahiluoto (Finland): I am speaking on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.34 on behalf of the European Union (EU). The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries Iceland and Norway members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, align themselves with this declaration.

The European Union welcomes draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.34, which all EU member States have sponsored and which we hope will be adopted without a vote. The European Union attaches great importance to the issue of security, non-proliferation and disarmament in the Mediterranean region.

As stated in the EU strategy against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction adopted by our leaders in December 2003, security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean. This draft resolution also recognizes that prospects for closer Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in all spheres can be enhanced by positive developments worldwide, in particular in Europe, in the Maghreb and in the Middle East.

The European Union also welcomes the inclusion in the draft resolution of the necessity of combating terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, including the possible resort by terrorists to weapons of mass destruction.

In the context of working towards strengthening security and stability in that crucial region, the European Union welcomes Libya's decision to eliminate all material equipment and programmes which lead to the production of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, together with the practical steps to implement that decision it has undertaken since. The case of Libya demonstrates that the problem of proliferation can be tackled through discussion and engagement and that States have nothing to fear from coming forward and admitting non-compliance.

The European Union attaches particular importance to the broad goal of transforming the Mediterranean into a sea of peace, security, stability, cooperation and development. We would like to recall that the Barcelona or Euro-Mediterranean process, launched in 1995 as the Mediterranean dimension of the Union's external policy, has made a major contribution to the establishment and development of a global partnership among the European Union, its member countries and Mediterranean partners. That partnership includes engagements regarding the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disarmament, zones free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, verification, conventional weapons, confidence-building measures and the fight against terrorism.

We would also like to take this opportunity to highlight some recent events contributing to security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. We welcome the adoption at the Euro-Mediterranean summit, held in Barcelona in November 2005, of the Euro-Mediterranean Code of Conduct on Countering Terrorism. We also welcome the Euro-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, held in Rabat in July 2006, and look forward to the EU-Africa Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, to be held in Tripoli, Libya, in November this year. These meetings present tangible opportunities to strengthen cooperation in the Mediterranean region on all aspects of migration and development, including the challenges associated with illegal immigration. Combating the trafficking and smuggling of human beings in the Mediterranean region needs to be strengthened through enhanced political dialogue and judicial and police cooperation.

We also welcome the convening in Rome of the third workshop to promote the universality of the Chemical Weapons Convention in the Mediterranean Basin and the Middle East, and the fact that the Eighth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction — the so-called Ottawa Convention — will be held in Jordan next year.

The European Union calls on all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to accede to all multilaterally negotiated legally binding instruments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to strengthen peace and cooperation in that region.

Mr. Ngoh Ngoh (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation is taking the floor to make a general statement regarding draft resolutions being considered under cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

My country attaches great importance to regional disarmament efforts, as they help to attain the objective of general and complete disarmament and contribute significantly to international peace and security. We are also convinced of the importance and effectiveness of confidence-building measures adopted at the initiative and with the participation of all States concerned, taking duly into account the distinct characteristics of each region. Indeed, my delegation believes that such measures can contribute to regional stability and international peace and stability.

Thus, my country welcomes the important role played since its establishment by the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa in promoting confidence-building measures, arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation in the subregion. The Committee has laid the groundwork for a regional security system, particularly by adopting a non-aggression pact and establishing the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa. We thank the Secretary-General and Member States for the valuable support that they have provided in that regard. We hope to continue to benefit from that support, particularly through the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.33, on activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions under cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee will first proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.33. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.33, entitled "Activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa", was introduced by the representative of Rwanda at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors are listed in A/C.1/61/L.33 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5.

I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.33.

> "Under the terms of operative paragraphs 12, 13, 14, 15 and 19 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, respectively,
>
>> "'[Request] the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to continue to provide their full assistance for the proper functioning of the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa';
>>
>> "'[Request] the Secretary-General, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1197 (1998), to provide the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee with the necessary support for the implementation and smooth functioning of the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa;
>>
>> "'[Also request] the Secretary-General to support the establishment of a network of parliamentarians with a view to the creation of a subregional parliament in Central Africa;
>>
>> "'[Request] the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue to provide increased assistance to the countries of Central Africa for coping with the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories'; and
>>
>> "'[Request] the Secretary-General to continue to provide the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee with assistance to ensure that they are able to carry on their efforts'.
>
> "Provisions for implementation of the activities regarding assistance for the proper functioning of the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa, referred to in operative paragraph 12 of the draft resolution, have been provided under section 23, 'Human rights', of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The activities of the Standing Advisory Committee — including those related to the implementation and functioning of the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa, referred to in operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, and those related to the establishment of a network of parliamentarians, referred to in operative paragraph 14 — are expected to be funded from voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa.
>
> "Implementation of the activities regarding increased assistance to the countries of Central Africa for coping with the problems of refugees and displaced persons in their territories, referred to in operative paragraph 15 of the draft resolution, would be subject to the availability of voluntary contributions to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Implementation of the request regarding the provision of assistance to the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee, referred to in operative paragraph 19, would be carried out

> within the resources already provided under Section 4, 'Disarmament', of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.
>
> "Therefore, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.33 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed a wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

It is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.33 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.34. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.34, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 18th meeting, on 20 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/61/L.34 and in A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1. In addition, Moldova has become a sponsor.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.34 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.41. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.41, entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 15th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/61/L.41 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed a wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.41 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.42. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.42, entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/61/L.42 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed a wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.42 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.43, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in A/C.1/61/L.43 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1. In addition, Peru has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

> Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark,

Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India.

Abstaining:

Bhutan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.43 was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Spain advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Prashad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.43, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". This draft resolution requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. Since India believes that the Conference, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has a mandate to negotiate disarmament instruments of global application, my delegation has voted against the draft resolution. Moreover, the United Nations Disarmament Commission has already, in 1993, adopted by consensus guidelines and recommendations for regional disarmament. There is no need, therefore, for the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in formulating principles on the same subject, especially when it already has several other priority issues on its agenda.

Furthermore, we believe that the security concerns of States extend beyond narrowly defined regions. Consequently, the idea of preserving a balance in defence capabilities in the regional or subregional context is both unrealistic and unacceptable to our delegation.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security". Before proceeding to the vote, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing either to make a general statement other than an explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): In Cuba's view, cluster 6, entitled "Other disarmament measures and international security", contains a number of relevant draft resolutions. I would like to refer in particular to the three draft resolutions submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement: A/C.1/61/L.6, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation"; A/C.1/61/L.7, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control"; and A/C.1/61/L.8, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

Cuba is of the view that these three draft resolutions address issues of interest not only to countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement, but to all States Members of the United Nations. The relevance of the issues covered in these texts was stressed by the heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement meeting in Havana, Cuba, at last September's summit. Numerous States have sent information to the Secretary-General on the specific measures they have taken to comply with the provisions contained in past resolutions on these subjects. This information, in the view of my delegation, is extremely useful for all States. Therefore, we make an appeal to countries which, for one reason or another, have not yet done so, to respond to the requests for information contained in those resolutions so that their views may be duly reflected in the corresponding reports of the Secretary-General.

In conclusion, let me urge each and every delegation to support the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/61/L.6, L.7 and L.8, submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement. We hope that they will receive the positive votes of the vast majority of the members gathered together in this room.

The Chairperson: As no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, we will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.6. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.6, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.6.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.6 was adopted by 117 votes to 4, with 50 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.7. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.7, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.7.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.7 was adopted by 168 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.8, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.8. In addition, Ukraine has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

France, Israel.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.8 was adopted by 169 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/61/L.22.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/61/L.22, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.22 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft decision have asked that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/61/L.22 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.30.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.30, entitled "United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 12th meeting, on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.30 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.30 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.31.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.31, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 12th meeting, on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.31 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5. In addition, the Philippines has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.31 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 18th meeting, on 20 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.35. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Chile, Ethiopia, Madagascar and Turkmenistan.

The Secretary-General wishes to put on record the following statement of financial implications regarding draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35.

> "By operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35, the General Assembly would
>
> > "'[Request] the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a Group of governmental experts, to be established in 2009 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to continue to study existing and potential threats in the sphere of information security and possible cooperative measures to address them, as well as the concepts referred to in paragraph 2 above, and to submit a report on the results of this study to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session'.
>
> "It is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold one organizational session in Geneva in 2009 and three substantive sessions in New York in 2010. The conference servicing requirements for the group of governmental experts is estimated to be $122,600 for 2009, at current rates.
>
> "In addition, the non-conference servicing requirements — including travel of experts and consultancy costs for the substantive servicing of the organizational session of the proposed group of governmental experts in 2009 — have been estimated at $115,600.
>
> "These requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Furthermore, the resource requirements pertaining to the meetings of the group of governmental experts in 2010 would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the following biennium, 2010-2011.
>
> "Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35 was adopted by 169 votes to 1.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.50.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.50, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the draft resolution and in A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Tonga, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.50 was adopted by 107 votes to 52, with 13 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position or vote after the voting.

Ms. Darlow (New Zealand): I take the floor today on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.6.

We are disappointed that, once again, we are unable to support this draft resolution. Our firm and unwavering commitment to multilateral principles and approaches in the field of disarmament and international security is well established, and we have consistently advocated the benefits of multilateral approaches in achieving progress on collective security issues.

However, the implication in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.6 that multilateralism constitutes the sole core means to pursue negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation is not one with which we can agree. Effective progress on global disarmament and non-proliferation objectives requires a mutually reinforcing system of multilateral, plurilateral, regional, bilateral and unilateral measures, working in tandem to achieve concrete results.

In our view, any assertion that multilaterally agreed solutions provide the only sustainable method of addressing disarmament and international security issues sells short the potential of alternative approaches, such as bilateral and regional measures, to contribute to disarmament and peacebuilding efforts.

These are the reasons why we have been unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.6 and have, instead, abstained.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft decision A/C.1/61/L.22, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

We joined the consensus on this draft decision. However, as my delegation has already stated during the thematic debate of the First Committee, there are some observations on this draft decision that should be taken into account. First, the composition of the Panel on Verification in All its Aspects lacks the appropriate balance needed for such a panel; regrettably, some regions and subregions have not been able to be represented on the Panel. Therefore, the report of the Panel might not reflect the views of all regions.

Secondly, as regards the procedure for the continuation of the work of that Panel of Government Experts, it is a matter of concern as to why there are no more meetings scheduled for this Panel. Indeed, it is unclear how a group of experts can reach a consensus on such an important issue without sitting down together and discussing the complex issues related to verification in all its aspects.

Ms. Yamin (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela joined the majority on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.35, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". However, because of the recent evolution of the issue at the multilateral level, and in order to achieve better balance in the consideration of the subject, we would like to discuss some relevant issues.

We would like to stress the need for joint efforts by the United Nations to prevent developments in the field of information and telecommunications from being used for purposes that run counter to the maintenance of international peace and security, without prejudice to the principle of universal, non-discriminatory access for all States to such technologies, as stated in the Geneva Declaration of Principles at the World Summit on the Information Society.

In addition, I would like to point out that international peace and security can be negatively impacted not only by the actions of non-State groups and actors, but by State aggression against the information or telecommunications systems of other States through the application of hostile policies. It is important to consider, for instance, possible aggression against national networks by foreign computer programs or by internal sources within a State that are promoted or conceived abroad, or aggression by means of radio or television broadcasts intended to disrupt the social order and constitutional institutions of the States to which these signals are transmitted. Those are only some possible actions contrary to international law and harmful to peaceful coexistence among States.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I would like to explain the United Kingdom vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.8, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

The United Kingdom welcomes the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy. This is particularly important in the fields of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. The United Kingdom does not believe that there is an automatic link between disarmament and development, but rather that there is a complex relationship between the two. Unfortunately, the draft resolution does not explain fully the complexity of this relationship.

As we have said in previous years, we also have some reservations about the report of the Group of Governmental Experts (A/59/119). For example, we believe that the report did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

Despite those reservations, the United Kingdom's broader commitment to development goals and our particular concern to combat the scourge of small arms and the impact that they have on the lives of people throughout the world mean that we can continue to support this draft resolution this year.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): The United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.8, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". Our delegation continues to believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference on this matter. Accordingly, the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the Declaration of the Final Document of that Conference.

Mr. Denot Medeiros (Brazil): I wish to take this opportunity to explain the vote of Brazil on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.50, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament". Since we recognize that scientific and technological development can have both civilian and military applications, we, of course, believe that, as recalled in the fifth preambular paragraph, it is necessary to regulate transfers of dual-use technologies and high technology with military applications. The emergence of proliferation threats attests to this need.

However, as an active member of the Missile Technology Control Regime and of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, which I, as representative of Brazil, currently chair, we cannot endorse the idea expressed in the sixth preambular paragraph that ad hoc export control regimes and arrangements for dual-use goods and technologies tend to impede the economic and social development of developing countries. In fact, export control standards are today recognized as an indispensable means to curb proliferation threats and are increasingly adhered to also by States that do not participate in non-proliferation regimes. The guidelines of those export control regimes are consistent with and complement the various international legally binding instruments in the field of nuclear non-proliferation, such as the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the treaties on nuclear-weapon-free zones.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.50.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I would like to explain our vote on draft decision A/C.1/61/L.22, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

While in the spirit of cooperation we had decided in 2004 to go along with resolution 59/60, which established the Panel of Government Experts, we were convinced neither then nor now that another panel of experts could make a significant contribution to the philosophy of verification. The inconclusive report of the Panel confirms that concern. We wish also to note our disappointment with the limited representation allowed to some important countries on the Panel. To lend greater legitimacy and vital acceptance among Member States, we hope that adequate representation of all relevant countries will be ensured in any future work on an important issue such as verification.

We continue to believe that verification is essential to promoting confidence among States in compliance with disarmament treaties and agreements to which they are parties. Verification ensures the effectiveness and integrity of such agreements. However, the concept and practice of verification is integral to arms limitation and disarmament agreements. It has no independent existence, and concepts relating to verification cannot be promoted in a vacuum.

Major disarmament initiatives have suffered setbacks since the verification principles were agreed upon. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Biological Weapons Convention protocol are examples. It is not for want of knowledge in the field of verification that these initiatives have been sidelined, but for political reasons. Verification was a goal for a fissile material cut-off treaty and now non-verification is a new objective. Moving the goalposts will erode the confidence of States in the effectiveness and integrity of multilateral treaties.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Egyptian delegation would like to voice its support for draft decision A/C.1/61/L.22, on verification in all its aspects. The draft decision encourages the Panel of Government Experts to complete its work as soon as possible, despite the fact that Member States did not receive all the information they wanted concerning the discussions and the work of the Panel of Experts during its three one-week sessions. There were thus many stumbling blocks and other points of disagreement that prevented a consensus from being reached on the Group's final report.

We are convinced that, given this methodology of work, whereby the Group of Governmental Experts failed to reach agreement at the end of the substantive sessions, the Group should be given an opportunity and encouraged by the General Assembly to complete its work and produce consensus results as soon as possible. Thus, this constitutes a welcome precedent. We encourage this measure, because it is useful and would promote the United Nations multilateral framework for considering the issue of disarmament.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". Before doing so, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing either to make a general statement other than an explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): My delegation wishes to announce that the United States will not participate in the action about to be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.11, "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

The Chairperson: Before we proceed to the voting on draft resolutions under cluster 7, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position before the voting.

Mr. Erciyes (Turkey): My delegation requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.29, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

This year, the draft resolution — texts similar to which have been adopted by consensus for many years — includes a new reference to the question of expanding the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. As stated in the 2006 report of the Conference (A/61/27), to which this draft resolution pertains, the views of member States on that issue are reflected in the Conference verbatim records.

In that respect, Turkey maintains the view that the question of expanding the Conference membership is not a priority at this stage and should be addressed on a case-by-case basis, giving due consideration to candidates' contributions to international peace and security. For that reason, the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should not be construed as a change in Turkey's well-known position on that question.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.9. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.9, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.9.

With the Chair's permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.9.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.9, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", I wish to place on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

> "Under the terms of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.9, the General Assembly would
>
> > "'[Request] the Secretary-General to provide all necessary support, within existing resources, to the regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities.'
>
> "The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under Section 4, 'Disarmament', of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The provision contained therein covers the three P-5 posts of Directors of the three regional

> centres for peace and disarmament. The programmes of activities of these three centres would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.
>
> "The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.
>
> "Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.9, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.9 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.11. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.11, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Republic of Korea at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.11 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.11 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.14. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.14, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", was introduced by the representative of Ecuador on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States at the 19th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.14 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1. In addition, Senegal has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.14, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

> "Under the terms of operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.14, the General Assembly would
>
> > "'[Request] the Secretary-General to provide the Regional Centre with all necessary support, within existing resources, so that it may carry out its programme of activities in accordance with its mandate'.
>
> "The implementation of the request would be carried out within the resources provided under section IV, 'Disarmament', of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The provision contained therein covers one P-5 post of Director of the Regional Centre at Lima. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.
>
> "The attention of the Committee is again drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.
>
> "Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.14, no

additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for 2006."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.14 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.29.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.29, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Slovakia at the 19th meeting, on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.29. In addition, Peru has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.29 was adopted.

The Chairperson: Before adjourning the meeting, I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make an announcement.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Representatives will find on their desks the executive summary of a joint study on the issue of small arms and light weapons brokering, undertaken by the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, in collaboration with the Small Arms Survey. The study analyses existing instruments at the regional, subregional and national levels addressing the illicit brokering of small arms and light weapons, and aims to identify common elements to enhance the understanding of the issue and to clarify its most complex aspects. It will be published in book form by mid-November. By that time, the executive summary now before members will also be available in all official languages of the United Nations. I would like to add that the study was made possible thanks to the financial contributions of the Governments of the Netherlands and Norway.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/61/PV.21

General Assembly

Sixty-first session

Official Records

First Committee

21st meeting

Thursday, 26 October 2006, at 3 p.m.
New York

Chairperson: Mrs. Juul .... (Norway)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairperson: The Committee will continue to take action on the remaining draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper no. 2, starting with cluster 1, namely, nuclear weapons. After completing action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, namely, conventional weapons, starting with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, followed by draft resolutions contained in clusters 6 and 7.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1 in informal working paper no. 2, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement other than explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions. Before doing so, I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): I have just three things to bring to the Committee's attention. First, informal paper no. 3, which will list the draft resolutions that the Committee will be acting on in our next meeting, will be circulated shortly in this room. It will contain all remaining drafts. Secondly, we still have one oral statement missing that pertains to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21. I would ask interested delegations to kindly contact the Secretariat tomorrow to find out exactly when — it is most likely going to be sometime tomorrow — the oral statement can be picked up at the Secretariat. Finally, delegations will also be getting document A/C.1/61/CRP.6 at this meeting, which contains the draft outline of work, our timetable and schedule for next year.

In accordance with recent practice, the First Committee will be taking a decision at the last meeting of this year's session. In that decision, we will adopt the programme of work and timetable for next year.

The Chairperson: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement other than explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Kahiluoto (Finland): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty". The Acceding Countries Bulgaria and Romania, the Candidate Countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, and the EFTA country Iceland, member of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, align themselves with this declaration.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is an essential part of the disarmament and non-proliferation regime, and the EU attaches utmost importance to the entry into force of the CTBT at the earliest possible date.

The European Union continues to call on all States, particularly Annex 2 States, to sign and ratify the Treaty without delay and without conditions. The tenth anniversary of the adoption of the CTBT by the United Nations General Assembly this year reminds us all of the need to redouble our efforts to complete the outstanding ratifications that are required for the entry into force of the Treaty.

The Union believes that the legally binding prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, explosions and all other nuclear explosions, as well as a credible verification regime, are vital. Pending the entry into force of the Treaty, we urge all States to abide by a moratorium and to refrain from any actions that are contrary to the obligations and provisions of the Treaty.

The European Union has strongly condemned the test of a nuclear explosive device by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 9 October 2006. That test, carried out in disregard of appeals from the international community, poses a danger to regional stability and represents a clear threat to international peace and security.

The European Union will implement fully all provisions of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, notably of resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1695 (2006).

The European Union strongly urges the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in compliance with resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1695 (2006), to return immediately to the Six-Party Talks, to work towards expeditious implementation of the Joint Statement of September 2005, in particular to verifiably abandon all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programmes, and to comply with its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which includes submitting all its nuclear activities to International Atomic Energy Agency verification.

The EU further calls on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to sign and ratify the CTBT, to refrain from conducting any further nuclear tests or missile launches and to re-establish its commitments to a moratorium on missile launching. The actions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea add to the risk of proliferation worldwide.

The European Union calls for redoubling of efforts to strengthen all aspects of the international system against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

There is an urgent need for the CTBT finally to enter into force. The EU fully supports the draft resolution under consideration. It has been sponsored by all EU member States.

Mr. Kim Kwang Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea opposes draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.32 and A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1, since they deal with nuclear tests by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a one-sided and biased manner. As we have repeatedly stressed earlier, the nuclear test by the Democratic People's Republic is an exercise of its legitimate right as a sovereign State, since it is a self-defence countermeasure to protect the sovereignty of the country and the life and security of the people from the intensified nuclear war threat, sanctions and pressures by the United States against the Democratic People's Republic.

These draft resolutions are the height of partiality and immorality in selectively taking up as an issue the exercise by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of its rights to defend the sovereignty of the country, while neglecting the hostile policy of the United States towards it, which is the root cause of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. The draft resolution will only intensify the confrontation rather than solve the issue.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will therefore vote against these draft resolutions, which do not help at all to solve the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea remains unchanged in its will to denuclearize the Korean peninsula through dialogue and negotiations. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic reiterates its principled position that it will make every possible effort to achieve the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and promote global nuclear disarmament and the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Chairperson: I take it that the statement of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was an explanation of vote before the vote. I will then give the floor to other delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before we proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions' cluster 1: "Nuclear weapons".

As there are none, we will then proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate votes have been requested on the last three words of operative paragraph 5 and on operative paragraph 5 as a whole.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 10th meeting on 10 October 2006. Sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.20, A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add. 1 and 2 thereto. In addition, Liberia has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on the three last words, namely, "and South Asia", in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India, Pakistan.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Burkina Faso, France, Israel, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The last three words of operative paragraph 5 were retained by 160 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 operative paragraph 5 as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20. This vote is on operative paragraph 5 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 operative paragraph 5 was retained by 161 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Colombia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 as a whole.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, India, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 as a whole was adopted by 168 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairperson: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", was issued on 16 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.32* and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1 and Add.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: the Philippines, Senegal, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, India, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Pakistan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32 was adopted by 168 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Equatorial Guinea advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 10th meeting, on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1* and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.2. In addition, Liberia and Senegal have become sponsors.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Colombia, India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1 was adopted by 175 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.53.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.53, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.53 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.53 was adopted.

The Chairperson: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Bugallo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): Spain fully supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at and agreed upon by consensus among the States of the region in question. Spain has always unequivocally expressed its support for the objectives of treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, because we understand that they make an important contribution to the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and to efforts leading to nuclear disarmament. Therefore, our delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, which the Committee has just adopted, is important for the establishment of such zones and for cooperation among them. Indeed, Spain has supported provisions of the draft resolution in the past, voting in favour of its antecedents at the fifty-third and fifty-fourth sessions.

However, on this occasion, the Spanish delegation decided to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, as it has done with respect to similar texts since the fifty-fifth session, in view of the realization of a concept about which my country has always had reservations: the holding of international conferences of States parties and signatories to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in order to support the common objectives envisaged in such treaties, which is referred to in paragraph 8.

In its seventh preambular paragraph, the draft resolution just adopted also refers to the possibility of holding, among other types of exchanges, joint meetings of States parties, signatories and observers to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in order to enhance cooperation among such zones — a concept to which Spain has no objection.

Nevertheless, as has been noted, the text on which the Committee has just voted refers in paragraph 8 to something that my delegation has always understood to be a new concept: an international conference that is qualitatively different and, what is more, means moving away from existing consensus on nuclear-weapon-free zones. In fact, that concept does not appear to be mentioned in any part of the April 1999 report of the Disarmament Commission working group on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among the States of the region concerned (see A/54/42) or in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2000/28) in the paragraphs referring to nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Spain participated actively in both negotiations and is pleased to see that they led to satisfactory, although difficult, consensus. Spain believes that those two documents constitute an adequate foundation and there are no additional political or legal elements that would justify holding such an international conference. Therefore, my delegation was not in a position to endorse the proposal or, consequently, to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Darwish (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", because Syria has always maintained that such an important and sensitive Treaty and the future obligations that it will place on all States must not in any way, shape or form ignore the legitimate concerns of the non-nuclear States, which constitute the large majority of the world's countries. Those States have not been given assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Nor are they being allowed to acquire the advanced peaceful technology that is indispensable for accelerating the pace of their development.

Important and fair-minded commentators on the Treaty all agree that it does not commit the nuclear-weapon States to eliminate their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable time frame or explicitly refer to the illegality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Nor does it reaffirm the need to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in order to put an end to proliferation in all its aspects.

All commentators on the Treaty also agree that the text is limited to a prohibition of nuclear test explosions and does not address laboratory tests or the development of new types of nuclear weapons. They also agree that on-site inspection and verification could open the door to the abuse of certain data provided by national verification systems and to the use of such data for political purposes. The strangest thing about the Treaty is that it allows signatories to take measures against non-signatories, including possible Security Council measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, thus violating the sovereign right of States to adhere or not adhere to the Treaty. The Syrian Arab Republic views such substantive loopholes with grave concern.

Syria firmly rejects the inclusion of Israel on the list of Middle East countries. Israel is the only country there to possess nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; it continues to develop those weapons qualitatively and quantitatively. Israel still refuses to accede to the NPT or to place its nuclear facilities under the monitoring and safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. All of that impedes and threatens efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and subjects the region and the entire world to the risk of an Israeli nuclear threat, without any reaction at the international level.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I wish to say how pleased my delegation is to see you, Madam, presiding over our work. My delegation is taking the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". France decided to lend its support to this draft resolution submitted by Japan on the question of nuclear disarmament. With its vote, my country wished to show its support for States that are considering the issue of nuclear disarmament seriously and in good faith and that are endorsing the text proposed by Japan in growing numbers.

The text of the draft resolution has been revised in its substance and its form, compared to the version of two years ago. It is a solid text that brings up questions of substance, including two that are of particular importance to my country: irreversibility and transparency. France recalls that in its 25 April 2005 Common Position, concerning the 2005 NPT Review Conference, the European Union articulated the application of the principle of irreversibility to guide all nuclear disarmament and arms control measures, as a contribution to the maintenance and strengthening of international peace, security and stability, given those conditions. The European Union Common Position promoted efforts towards transparency which are a voluntary confidence-building measure to help make fresh progress in disarmament.

Our positive vote today does not imply renunciation of that position, which remains the reference for our engagement in those two areas. We would wish that in future our position can be better taken into account. France recalls too that nuclear deterrence remains an essential foundation of its security and that the question of nuclear disarmament in conformity with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is among the elements for general and complete disarmament and cannot be dissociated from analyses of the state of international security and stability.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I wish to make a joint explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". I will be speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, France and the United States.

Last year, as in previous years, our three delegations voted against this draft resolution. We note that the draft resolution's preamble recalls the applicable principles and rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the rights of passage through maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. We welcome the acknowledgment of that important point. We do not want those principles and rules to be affected.

In essence, however, we continue to believe that it is contradictory to propose simultaneously an area that would be composed largely of the high seas and yet to say it would not apply to the high seas. We question, therefore, whether the real goal of this draft resolution is, in fact, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We do not believe that this ambiguity has been sufficiently clarified, and for that reason we have voted against the draft resolution again this year.

We would like to emphasize, however, that we attach great importance to the development of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones, which could make an important contribution to regional and global security, provided they are supported by nuclear-weapon States and all States of the region concerned; are subject of appropriate treaties, including general assurances provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency; and were satisfactorily concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States, as set out in the 1999 Disarmament Commission guidelines.

Mr. Roa Arboleda (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation was once again obliged, as it was at the previous session of the First Committee, to abstain, at this sixty-first session, in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", despite Colombia's traditional commitment to nuclear disarmament and control and to monitoring and inspection systems.

The Provisional Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and its Preparatory Committee are aware of the constitutional impediments preventing Colombia from becoming a party to the Treaty. Our arguments have been made publicly and in a transparent manner over the past six years.

Colombia would like once again to reaffirm its unswerving support for the letter and the spirit of that instrument and its resolve to continue to seek ways of overcoming those constitutional impediments, which relate exclusively to the payment of contributions to the Preparatory Commission before the Treaty's ratification.

My delegation is most appreciative of the interest expressed by certain States with respect to finding a solution to those impediments. We hope that we will be able to ratify this important instrument as soon as possible; that is something to which we truly aspire.

My delegation would like also to express its specific support for operative paragraph 5 of the draft, which is fully in keeping with the content of the press communiqué issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia on 10 October last.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation with respect to two draft resolutions.

Let me turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination to work towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

We are in agreement with the main objective of this draft resolution, which is the call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination.

Last year my delegation, despite some reservations on the text, changed its previous position and voted in favour of this draft resolution in hopes that the text of the draft would be improved this year. However, the text of the current draft just adopted by the Committee is, in our view, not appropriately balanced.

For instance, while the draft refers to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, it is focused on only one issue, namely a fissile material cut-off treaty. However, even the reference to the fissile material cut-off treaty is not consistent with previous agreements reached by Member States on its verifiability and the mandate agreed upon by the Conference on Disarmament in 1995. My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32.

I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" (CTBT).

Since the Islamic Republic of Iran supports a total ban on weapons of mass destruction and their development, in particular nuclear weapons, my delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution. However, prospects for the CTBT's entry into force have faced a serious setback due to the rejection of the ratification process by the United States. It only partially supports the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) Preparatory Commission. Although a nuclear-test moratorium has been declared, some efforts are under way in the United States which put into question its commitment to the moratorium.

Following the adoption of the Nuclear Posture Review, which provides for the development of new types of nuclear weapons, the possible use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, and targeting nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty, millions of dollars have been allocated to reducing the time necessary to resume nuclear tests to 18 months.

The Nuclear Posture Review furthermore recognizes

> "the need for a revitalized nuclear-weapons complex that will be able, if directed, to design, develop, manufacture and certify new warheads in response to new national requirements and maintain readiness to resume underground nuclear testing if required."

Test explosions are a key asset in the design, development and refinement of nuclear weapons, and can also be carried out through either simulated nuclear tests using supercomputers or through subcritical tests.

According to recent reports, the National Nuclear Security Administration promised that:

> "The production of plutonium triggers for current weapons, called pits, would remain limited at about 50 per year. Under the Bush plan, the new plutonium centre could produce 125 pits per year, a number that would satisfy current planning for the 2,200-new-warhead stockpile of the future."

As recommended by the WMD Commission, it should reconsider its position and proceed to ratify the CTBT. Only ratification of the CTBT can offer the prospect of a permanent and legally binding commitment to ending nuclear testing.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like explain its vote on two draft resolutions, A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", and A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), voted in favour of these draft resolutions because of our commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. My country believes that multilateral nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation efforts should be carried out simultaneously under the aegis of the United Nations, with a view to achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Venezuela rejects the carrying out of nuclear tests and at the same time believes that the existence of nuclear weapons poses a threat to the survival of humankind and that their total elimination is the only genuine guarantee against their use or the threat of their use.

We are also opposed to the development of new nuclear weapons and favour the destruction of existing weapons. We are convinced that the most effective way to achieve the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world is for all States without exception to adhere to the multilateral agreements that have been negotiated in the area of nuclear weapons and to respect and implement their provisions. We therefore believe that we should not relent in efforts to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. In that regard, we reaffirm that nuclear-weapon States should implement the 13 practical steps set out in the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. We also believe that it is essential for those States to provide us, the non-nuclear-weapon States, with guarantees against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament considered for action this afternoon under cluster 1. I shall begin with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution recognizes the well-established principle that nuclear-weapon-free zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. However, that principle has not been applied in calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This specific proposal logically has no greater validity than the establishment of similar zones in many other parts of the world, such as East Asia, Western Europe or North America. Our delegation therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against the last three words of paragraph 5 — "and South Asia" — as well as against paragraph 5 as a whole.

I should like now to turn to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". India shares the basic intent of that draft resolution, namely, the elimination of nuclear weapons. We agree that, as set out in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control is the ultimate objective of States. We also appreciate Japan's commitment to that goal. However, we find that the draft resolution incorporates certain elements that are not acceptable to our delegation, such as the call to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Therefore, while agreeing with the basic objective of the draft resolution — that is, the total elimination of nuclear weapons — we were forced to vote against the draft resolution.

Finally, as a country that maintains the friendliest and most fraternal ties with Mongolia, India welcomes the adoption without a vote of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.53, on Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status. We note the many steps that Mongolia has taken to reinforce that status, and that Mongolia has received support and security assurances for that status from Member States, in particular those that possess nuclear weapons. India fully respects the choice made by Mongolia and is willing to respond, whenever required, with every possible support and commitment to Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): I am taking the floor to explain the votes of the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", and draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

The United States considers that, of all the draft resolutions introduced on nuclear disarmament, draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32* is the most balanced and most realistic. In particular, we note its support for compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, its recognition of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions between the United States and Russia, its call for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty and its positive reference to International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards agreements and the Model Additional Protocol. This year, we applaud the condemnation, in the final preambular paragraph, of the nuclear test by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. At the same time, the United States has continued to vote against this draft resolution and its predecessors because of its support for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in paragraph 9. As representatives are aware, the United States opposes that Treaty.

Those considerations apply as well to the United States vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*. We cannot support a draft resolution supporting the CTBT. Nevertheless, I would like to note our support for the position expressed in paragraph 5, which condemns the nuclear tests by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and demands that that country not conduct further tests.

Mr. Khalilullah (Pakistan): I should like to explain our votes on three draft resolutions under this cluster. I shall start with an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

Pakistan has always supported the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the regions concerned. However, the call in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia fails to acknowledge the reality on the ground. My delegation would like to recall that for 24 years Pakistan itself sought unsuccessfully to promote that objective in the region. The nuclear explosions in South Asia on 11 and 13 May 1998 disrupted the strategic balance in South Asia, which obliged Pakistan to conduct its tests to restore strategic stability. With those explosions, however, the objective of establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons was defeated. Therefore, the insertion of South Asia into the resolution runs counter to the realities on the ground. Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the vote on paragraph 5, as well as on the resolution on the whole, and voted against the last three words in paragraph 5.

I shall now explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". My delegation does not agree with several provisions of the draft resolution. The draft resolution places lopsided emphasis on non-proliferation, rather than on nuclear disarmament. That indeed reflects a regression in this vital area. In accordance with our consistent position, we cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State; nor do we consider ourselves to be bound by any of the provisions that emanate from the NPT Review Conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. While my delegation supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, it cannot agree to some of the proposals in the draft resolution, which are both selective and unrealistic.

In view of those reservations, my delegation has abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

I will now explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", contained in document A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*.

Over the years, Pakistan has consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). We have been voting in favour of this draft resolution in the Committee. We have voted for the draft resolution this year as well.

In keeping with our policy of restraint and responsibility, Pakistan has observed a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing which we believe is in line with the object and purpose of the CTBT. We would have liked the draft resolution to appropriately reflect this element.

My delegation continues to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for promoting signatures and ratifications leading to the CTBT's entry into force will be facilitated when major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to restore their support. Acceptance of CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help expedite its entry into force.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

My delegation, while supporting a number of elements contained in this draft resolution concerning the total elimination of nuclear weapons and their non-proliferation, deems it important that the draft resolution reflect all of the norms governing the non-proliferation regime established by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and by the resolution and decisions on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review Conference as well as the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference. The draft resolution should reflect the commitments made by the nuclear-weapon States under article VI of the NPT and the 13 practical steps on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, adopted by consensus in 2000.

My delegation believes also that operative paragraph 11 runs counter to the consensus that emerged in the Disarmament Commission with regard to negotiations on an international effectively verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty. We would like to cooperate with Japan in the coming period to ensure respect and protection for the NPT in a manner consistent with the principles contained in the draft resolution on non-proliferation and disarmament.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on two draft resolutions.

I turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Over the past few years, the main sponsor of this draft — Japan — has introduced several amendments making the draft resolution before us more balanced. That has enabled my delegation in recent years to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

We support the ultimate objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons in the context of general and complete disarmament. While we cannot support some of the paragraphs in the draft resolution, which differ significantly from Israel's policy, we support other paragraphs, particularly those related to non-proliferation, the crucial importance of the development of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) verification regime, and the condemnation of nuclear testing by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

On the second draft resolution — A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" — Israel's signature of the CTBT in September 1996 reflected its longstanding policy of bringing itself closer, wherever possible, to international norms on nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation. The importance of the CTBT is especially pronounced in the light of the challenges related to nuclear non-proliferation and the non-compliance that have been so evident in recent years in the Middle East.

The recent nuclear explosion reportedly conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aggravates the situation further and adds to the already existing instability in North-East Asia. Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission of the CTBT in November 1996, Israel has played a major part in various activities aimed at developing all elements of the CTBT verification regime. That demonstrates the importance that Israel attaches to the CTBT, which it views as an important contribution to enhancing international peace and security.

Israel voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1* in the light of the importance it attaches to the objectives of the CTBT, notwithstanding its reservations regarding operative paragraph 1.

Israel believes that progress remains to be made in the development of the CTBT verification regime, whose completion is a prerequisite for the entry into force of the Treaty, as required by the first paragraph of article IV of the CTBT. The Treaty's verification regime should be robust so as to detect non-compliance with its basic obligations, be immune to abuse, and, at the same time, allow each signatory State to protect its national security interests. For Israel, completing the verification regime constitutes a major consideration for ratifying the Treaty.

Two other important considerations for ratification include Israel's sovereign equality status in the policy-making organs of the Treaty, including those related to the geographical region of the Middle East and South Asia, and in the Executive Council of the future Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), and adherence to and compliance with the Treaty by States in the Middle East.

We believe that, pending the CTBT's entry into force, the Treaty's advancement calls for the following commitments and activities to be diligently pursued by all States: sustain the commitment not to carry out any nuclear-weapon-test explosions, in line with the Treaty's basic obligation; complete, as soon as possible, the CTBT's verification regime; operate, maintain and test the International Monitoring System (IMS) and the International Data Centre (IDC) prior to their entry into force in order to gain experience and to provide early detection capabilities, and, in addition, where coverage gaps of the (IMS) stations exist, take temporary measures to fill those gaps, such as the operation of auxiliary seismic stations as primary ones until all primary stations are effectively functioning and transferring data; maintain the technical and political nature of the Preparatory Commission's work and respect its rules and procedures; and use IMS and IDC capabilities without detracting from their primary objectives as the verification instruments of the Treaty to support tsunami warning systems in order to alert threatened populations in a timely manner and save human lives.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". I first call on delegations wishing to make general statements regarding this cluster.

Mr. Ogunbanwo (Nigeria): In his address to the General Assembly at the 18th meeting of its present session, on 25 September 2006, President Olusegun Obasanjo took the lead in calling for "a comprehensive and legally binding global arms trade treaty". Today, my delegation wishes to express its satisfaction that an impressive number of countries have stated their support for draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55. We believe that, first and foremost, an arms trade treaty should establish a common standard on arms transfers, regulate the international arms trade and ensure the non-diversion of arms to unauthorized end-users.

In that connection, we urge all Member States to be guided by the example provided by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) when in June this year it adopted the landmark Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials. The Convention contains very far-reaching provisions on international arms transfers, provisions that are not to be found in the existing norms on that issue.

Inter alia, the Convention places a ban on arms transfers into, from and through West Africa. Of greatest significance is the ban placed on the transfer of small arms and light weapons to non-State actors implicated in the recurrent conflicts in West Africa and in the attendant political instability and destruction of infrastructure. A State member of ECOWAS shall be granted exemption from such transfers solely for the purposes of legitimate national defence, security needs or participation in peacekeeping efforts, but these will have to receive certification and approval from other member States.

My delegation looks forward to working with other delegations to ensure the success of the goals of resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

Before concluding, I wish to acknowledge the prominent role played by civil society — in particular the International Action Network on Small Arms — in the campaign for an arms trade treaty, as well as its efforts to reduce armed violence.

The Chairperson: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I wish to introduce a technical revision to the translation into French of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". The francophone delegations in this room have brought to the attention of the original authors that the French text contains some implicitly prejudicial language. As colleagues will know, that was not the intention of the authors. We will therefore make a recommendation to the Secretariat in writing to correct that impression, but for the convenience of delegations, and with apologies for my Churchillian version of this noble language, I shall read out the text of the seventh preambular paragraph as it should read in French: "Réaffirmant le respect qu'elle porte au droit international, notamment au droit des droits de l'homme et au droit international humanitaire, et à la Charte".

The Chairperson: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

Jamaica fully supports the objective of an arms trade treaty, recognizing its purposeful intent and the reality that many regions around the world are grappling with the harrowing effects of the illicit use of small arms and its emergence as a contributing factor to many of the world's ills, including crime, terrorism, internal and external conflict and the displacement of persons, thereby continuing to undermine efforts aimed at peace, reconciliation, safety, security, stability and, ultimately, sustainable development.

Jamaica does not manufacture arms or ammunition. Nevertheless, access to illegal weapons and ammunition and the consequently high levels of gun violence place an unmanageable burden on a country's economic and social structure. This draft resolution thus holds significant interest for us, given its possible far-reaching impact, certainly not as a panacea but, as its title suggests, leading towards a legally binding instrument establishing a comprehensive regime to regulate conventional arms.

Jamaica does not have a fundamental difficulty with the draft resolution. In fact, recent history will reveal that Jamaica, along with other States participating in the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting held in Malta last year, supported calls for the work on such a treaty to begin with the United Nations. It will also be recalled that, earlier in the general debate in the First Committee, Jamaica expressed support for an arms trade treaty. However, Jamaica feels that the draft resolution would have had greater balance and wider scope had it incorporated the following elements.

The second preambular paragraph should have included reference to the 2001 Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, to General Assembly resolution 60/81 of 8 December 2005 and to decision 60/519, by which the Assembly adopted the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons. In addition, the fifth preambular paragraph should have included an element of control over the production, export, import, transfer and re-transfer of conventional weapons, in order to prevent their illicit trafficking or their diversion to unauthorized recipients. Furthermore, Jamaica has no problem with the establishment of a group of experts. However, the question legitimately arises as to whether, procedurally, the group can be established before Member States submit their views and the Secretary-General presents his report to the General Assembly. In that context, we feel that paragraph 2 seems to be somewhat premature.

Notwithstanding the concerns we have expressed, Jamaica will vote in favour of the draft resolution, but thought it necessary to explain our vote in advance.

Mr. Kahiluoto (Finland): I wish to speak, on behalf of the European Union (EU) and the States that have aligned themselves with this statement, regarding draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

The European Union attaches great importance to the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and supports all efforts aimed at its full implementation. The Union is the largest donor of international assistance to efforts to contribute to the objectives of the Programme of Action. In December 2005, the Union adopted an integrated strategy at the level of heads of Government to combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and their ammunition. Our broad-based approach to all issues covered by the Programme of Action, including the International Instrument on marking and tracing, is well known. While the European Union appreciates the work done by the three co-authors of the draft resolution — South Africa, Japan and Colombia — as well as their desire to secure a consensus text, it has yet again been disappointing to us that two modest, yet highly relevant, amendments proposed by the European Union have not been included.

The EU proposals for two new preambular paragraphs covered two key issues. The first was to take note of the continued exchange of views on national and regional practices and lessons learned relating to national controls on transfers of small arms and light weapons. The second was to encourage, where appropriate, the continued integration of efforts aimed at preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons into relevant national and local plans and strategies.

While we were disappointed with the outcome of the Review Conference this July, negotiations revealed that there was a broad range of support for transfer controls, which would have been part of consensus language if a final document had been agreed upon. The EU noted the considerable flexibility and spirit of compromise that many delegations showed. We also noted that there was wide recognition of the importance and relevance of these issues to the effective implementation of the Programme of Action.

The European Union supports the aims and principles of this draft resolution. It is for that reason that the European Union will vote in favour of it. But we are unable to become a sponsor of a text that does not contain the two key features that have such importance and relevance, not only to the EU but to a wide range of delegations from all regions and perspectives.

We would also like to make the following remarks with regard to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The EU regards the regular global exchange of views regarding the implementation of the Programme of Action as essential to maintaining its momentum. It provides a much needed opportunity for all Member States to take stock of progress and to examine at the global level the actions we have taken nationally and at the regional level. Our view remains firm that such meetings, held on a regular basis, are a part of the Programme of Action. As such, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution under consideration provides a mechanism to set a date for which we can all plan.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". This is, without a doubt, one of the most innovative and ambitious initiatives introduced in the First Committee in recent years. We are convinced of the good intentions that inspired the sponsors of the draft resolution, and we fully share many of their concerns.

Despite the end of the cold war, the trade in arms has not decreased. Instead, it has grown, as can be seen in the continuous growth in world military expenditures, which now exceed $1 trillion. A single country — the United States — spends as much on weapons as the rest of the world combined, while American companies produce 60 per cent of the armaments sold in the world. Only the thirst for profit and domination by certain States can explain why some oppose minimal controls over arms transfers, such as prohibitions on transfers to non-State actors.

The idea of adopting a treaty on the conventional arms trade entails carrying out a necessarily complex and highly sensitive exercise, given the direct security, political, economic and legal consequences it would have for States. In no way could such an exercise ignore the inherent right of States to legitimate self-defence, and hence their right to manufacture, export, import and possess conventional weapons in order to meet their security needs. Cuba believes that the importance of those rights is not merely a formality. Rather, it is a matter of national security.

For more than 40 years, our country has been subject to an aggressive and hostile policy by the strongest military Power in the world, which possesses the most sophisticated of weaponry, including nuclear weapons. Cuba does not have and never will have weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, conventional weapons are a necessary tool for the defence of our sovereignty and our territorial integrity. We regret the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not make a greater effort to take into account several of the legitimate concerns and constructive proposals made by the Cuban delegation and other delegations during the consultations.

In Cuba's opinion, this initiative must be conceived as a process done in stages. Therefore, we support the idea in operative paragraph 1 of the text, under which States would have the possibility to express their views on this matter. That would be a very useful first step towards more effective actions, with the participation and support of all States.

However, operative paragraph 2 in practice turns operative paragraph 1 into a mere formality without any real usefulness, as it prematurely prejudges the course to be followed, even when States have not had a minimum amount of time to consider the question and express their views and proposals.

Cuba cannot support an approach by which a matter of such importance for States, particularly since it concerns an international legal instrument, is considered by a group of experts. In the United Nations we all know quite well the limitations of those groups: very restricted participation, as decided by the Secretariat without the participation of States, and with the so-called equitable geographical distribution all too often being merely cosmetic. There are many such examples. We believe that operative paragraph 2 is in clear contradiction with the last preambular paragraph of the draft, which indicates the intention to carry out a process of negotiations on a non-discriminatory, transparent and multilateral basis.

We have stressed and will continue to stress the fact that a process such as the one intended in this draft resolution can be universally acceptable and therefore effective only with a guarantee of open and real participation of all States throughout the entire process. It is an issue of interest to us all and one to which we all can and should contribute.

Had the legitimate concerns raised by Cuba and other delegations been taken into account, we are convinced that the draft resolution would have had broader support today, which would have greatly facilitated the future path of this initiative. We hope that, with a view to next year, the sponsors will duly take these considerations into account.

For the reasons just stated, the Cuban delegation will vote in favour neither of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 nor the paragraphs that will be the subject of a separate vote.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reiterates its commitment to general and complete disarmament as an appropriate way of contributing to the strengthening of international peace and security. Nevertheless, my country has decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", as we believe that this initiative has not been sufficiently discussed, given its political, economic and social implications, as well as implications for the security and defence of States. In the opinion of Valenzuela, the initiative should have been dealt with one step at a time.

We believe it indispensable to first have consultations and get the views of all Member States, then to discuss them and finally, on the basis of that exchange of views, to determine whether or not it is appropriate to take action on those issues. The draft resolution prejudges, ab initio, the outcome of an exchange of views on the nature and viability of proceeding to the negotiation of an international treaty on trade in conventional arms and already decides on the establishment of a group of governmental experts as the setting for tackling this issue. We believe that this initiative requires further dialogue and consensus. That is why we have decided to abstain in the vote.

The Chairperson: If there are no other delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, entitled, "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and addenda 1 and 2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Azerbaijan, the Gambia, Liberia, Namibia, Peru and Senegal.

With the permission of the Chair, I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, entitled, "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

"By operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, the General Assembly would

> '[Decide] that, as stipulated in the Programme of Action, the next biennial meeting of States to consider the national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action, shall be held in New York no later than in 2008;
>
> '[Also decide] that the meeting of States to consider the implementation of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, shall be held within the framework of the biennial meeting of States'.

"Pursuant to operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the biennial meeting of States would hold one session of a duration of one week, in New York, no later than 2008.

"The conference servicing requirements for the biennial meeting of States is estimated to be $360,700 at current rates. These requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"The attention of the Committee is drawn to provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 172 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 10th meeting, on 10 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/L.47/CRP.5 and addenda 1 and 2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: the Gambia, Liberia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

> "By operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would
>
> > '[Request] the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the next meeting of the States parties and on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the eighth meeting of the States parties as observers'.
>
> "In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next meeting of the States parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating at that meeting, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. The Secretariat will prepare preliminary cost estimates for the next meeting for the approval of States parties, following a planning mission to assess the requirements for conference facilities and services.
>
> "It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating at the meeting.
>
> "Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kazakhstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 157 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55. A recorded vote has been requested.

Separate recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.55 and in A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and the two addenda thereto. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft: Azerbaijan, the Gambia and San Marino.

I should now like to read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

> "By operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, the General Assembly would, respectively,
>
> '[Request] the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on the feasibility, scope and draft parameters for a comprehensive, legally binding instrument establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms, and to submit a report on the subject to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session;
>
> '[Request] the Secretary-General to establish a group of governmental experts, on the basis of equitable geographic distribution, commencing in 2008, informed by the report of the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session, to examine the feasibility, scope and draft parameters for a comprehensive, legally binding instrument establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms, and to transmit the report of the group of experts to the General Assembly for consideration at its sixty-third session;
>
> '[Request] the Secretary-General to provide the group of governmental experts with any assistance and services that may be required for the discharge of its tasks'.

"Implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, 'Disarmament', of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold three sessions of one week's duration each in New York in 2008. The conference servicing requirements for the three sessions of the group of governmental experts are estimated to be $549,300. In addition, the non-conference-servicing requirements have been estimated at $431,700, which include travel of experts and the cost of consultants for the substantive servicing of the organizational session of the proposed group of governmental experts in 2008.

"These requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."

That concludes the oral statement of the Secretary-General that accompanied it.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 26 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 24 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, as a whole, was adopted by 139 votes to 1, with 24 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I will now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions in cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation wishes to state its position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55. China has noted the arms trade initiatives put forward by a number of countries. We are in favour of the international community taking necessary measures to effectively address the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. In that area, the comprehensive implementation of the Plan of Action adopted in July 2001 is of great importance. China is willing to make active efforts in that regard, with all parties concerned.

The legal trade in arms involves the security, defence and economic interests of all countries. The conduct of that trade should be determined primarily by the arms importing and exporting countries themselves. Whether it is necessary to establish common standards or international legal instruments to regulate the arms trade is an extremely complex and sensitive issue. Broad solicitation of the views of all countries, including the major arms-trading Powers, should be followed by serious in-depth discussion of relevant issues. Haste and ill-considered approaches should be avoided.

In view of those considerations, the Chinese delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 tends to prejudge the outcome of the discussions of the United Nations group of governmental experts. Therefore, we were not in a position to support the draft resolution.

I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that the Chinese Government has always followed a prudent and responsible approach to arms exportation and has put in place a strict export control system. It has always complied with the three principles of exports being conducive to the legitimate self-defence of the recipient country; that they cause no harm to the peace, security and stability of the region concerned and the world as a whole; and that they not constitute interference in the internal affairs of the recipient country.

China is also willing to participate actively and constructively in international discussions on issues related to the arms trade, and in work within the framework of the United Nations.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain the Cuban delegation's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". As in previous sessions, the Cuban delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Cuba, which is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons fully shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns that are associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. At the same time, it is well known that for more than four decades my country has been subjected to a policy of continued hostility and aggression by the military super-Power. Cuba is thus unable to renounce its right to the use of such weapons for the preservation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity, in keeping with its right to legitimate self-defence as recognized in the United Nations Charter. We will continue to fully support all efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian and national security issues, are intended to eliminate the terrible impact upon the civilians and economies of many countries of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines.

Mr. Fuls (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I wish to explain the position of our delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1. This year, as it has in the past on similar texts, Switzerland voted in favour of the draft resolution, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". Contrary to preceding years, we did not join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

My delegation emphasizes the importance of the implementation of the Programme of Action, and of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons.

With respect to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, we wish to recall the follow-up on the Instrument on marking and tracing, as defined in chapter VII of the Instrument (see A/60/88). Paragraph 37 clearly specifies that States will meet on a biennial basis within the framework of the biennial meetings on the Programme of Action, wherever those meetings are convened. We believe that in principle the meetings would be organized by 2008.

The consensus expressed at last year's World Summit on the links between security, peace, human rights and development must be reflected in common efforts at the international level. Therefore, Switzerland made a specific proposal for a preambular paragraph inspired by the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development. Other delegations made similar proposals. Our delegation continues to support the goals and principles of this draft resolution, while at the same time we regret that our proposal was not taken into consideration.

Mr. Bouchaara (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". The delegation of the Kingdom of Morocco would first like to thank the Australian delegation for the transparency and inclusive character of the consultations that were conducted on this draft resolution.

Morocco is not a signatory of the Convention for vital security reasons related to the defence of our territorial integrity and our legitimate national security interests. As it did during the previous session, however, the Moroccan delegation decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on implementation of the Ottawa Convention. Through this vote in favour of the draft resolution, the Kingdom of Morocco wishes to reiterate its support and devotion to the humanitarian objectives and principles of the Ottawa Convention.

Although not a signatory of the Convention, Morocco would like once again to express its commitment to supporting the review process. Additionally, Morocco voluntarily submitted a report on national measures taken, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Ottawa Convention. We should recall that Morocco has always de facto implemented a number of provisions of the Convention. My country has thus never produced or exported anti-personnel mines. Indeed, long before the Convention entered into force, we ceased to import anti-personnel mines.

Finally, our delegation wishes to emphasize that in 2002 my country ratified Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons regarding mines, booby traps and other devices, which the international community views as an essential instrument in terms of international humanitarian law. Our Accession to Amended Protocol II further demonstrates my country's determination to make a contribution in the struggle against the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has taken the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, on implementation of the Convention on anti-personnel mines and on their destruction — the Mine Ban Convention — and in document A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

I would like to begin with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes the inherent right of all States to self-defence. The fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution acknowledges the right of all States to manufacture, import, export, transfer and retain conventional arms for their self-defence. While engaging in trade in conventional arms, all States are bound to fully comply with arms embargos decided by the Security Council in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, in regulating the export of conventional arms, they are required to take into account their obligations under international law, including the Charter, international human rights law and international humanitarian law, which provide the universally acceptable standards and norms for the conduct of States.

India fully supports measures that would contribute to international peace, security, sustainable development and respect for human rights. We are not, however, convinced that it is the absence of common international standards on trade in conventional arms that is responsible for the irresponsible or illicit trade in conventional arms. In our view, it is the sole responsibility of States to establish firm control over trade in conventional arms, taking fully into account their obligations under both national and international law.

We support the proposal in paragraph 1 to request the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on further measures that may be necessary to establish full national control over trade in conventional arms. The draft resolution, however, prejudges the outcome of this consultation in requesting the Secretary-General, in paragraph 2, to establish a group of governmental experts. It would be appropriate if such a group were to be established through a resolution to be adopted at the sixty-second session, after taking into account the views expressed by Member States in response to the request contained in paragraph 1. We were therefore constrained to abstain in the votes on paragraphs 2 and 3 and also to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

I now turn briefly to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1. India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of anti-personnel landmines. India's participation in the Nairobi review conference and, since then, in the meetings of the States parties, reflects India's commitment to that vision. India has ratified Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, and has discontinued since 1997 the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and has observed a moratorium on their transfer.

Furthermore, India remains committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance and rehabilitation of mine victims, and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end. India has organized a number of camps in Afghanistan for the provision of prosthetics to victims of landmines in Afghanistan.

India believes that attaining the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines will be facilitated by the availability of effective and non-lethal alternative technologies that can perform, cost effectively, the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines. India supports the approach enshrined in Amended Protocol II, which addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. That is why India is not party to the Mine Ban Convention and abstained on the draft resolution on that subject.

Ms. Low (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Singapore's position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. Singapore supports and will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed against innocent and defenceless civilians. With this in mind, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium in May 1996 on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely. At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly states that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counterproductive.

Singapore supports international efforts to resolve the humanitarian concerns over anti-personnel landmines. We will continue to work with members of the international community towards finding a durable and truly global solution.

Ms. Mu (Myanmar): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Myanmar is resolutely in favour of banning the export, transfer and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines. Although Myanmar is not a State party to the Ottawa Convention, my delegation respects the position of the States parties to the Convention. We oppose the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines, which causes death and injury to innocent people all over the world.

At the same time, Myanmar believes that all States have the right to self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter: all States must possess the right to self-defence, as no State would compromise its national security and sovereign interests under any circumstances. In this regard, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

The Islamic Republic of Iran, as a country affected by the problem of the illicit trade in arms, which is in Iran's case linked to drug trafficking and operations of terrorist groups from outside the country, has always been supportive of efforts to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in arms. But my country attaches great importance to the issue of transfer control, in order to prevent such illicit trade.

Our approach during the recent regional United Nations Conference on Small Arms in negotiating a compromise text for the transfer control of the draft final document is indicative of the way we approach the issue of arms control.

Throughout the informal consultations held by the sponsors of the current draft resolution, either on a bilateral basis or in informal meetings, my delegation expressed its views and its readiness to engage in constructive cooperation. However, our views have not been reflected in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

In our view, the current draft contains some repetitions and contradictions and lacks a basis for consensus, which is necessary for such a draft resolution. Some of the preambular paragraphs are repetitive. Furthermore, in the operative part, the draft resolution seeks, on one hand, the views of Member States and yet, on the other hand — even before receiving the views of States — it requests the establishment of a group of governmental experts, which seems contradictory and, indeed, prejudges the views of Member States. During the sponsors' consultations, a proposal was made to reconcile this contradiction by pursuing a step-by-step approach. This proposal was supported by many delegations, including my own. Unfortunately, it has not been taken into consideration.

Last but not least, in such an important initiative, all of our major arms-producing countries should be involved; their support is necessary for any future successful instrument. Without the participation of the arms-producing States, even if we achieve such an ambitious goal, the treaty would turn into yet another ineffective instrument; it could also undermine the United Nations Programme of Action, which, in our view, would be a matter of serious concern.

While we will continue to examine the overall effectiveness, or ineffectiveness, of this proposed initiative, for the aforementioned reasons, my delegation has abstained on the draft resolution, at this stage.

Mr. El Hadj Ali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution, in accordance with our position of principle calling for the establishment, within the United Nations, of multilateral and transparent legal frameworks having to do not only with conventional weapons but also with all weapons. We, therefore, support any steps that would be taken to establish an international instrument that would define objective norms to regulate the transfer of conventional weapons. This type of instrument should, in our view, be the culmination of a process of multilateral, transparent cooperation as broad-based as possible, among Member States, who are the only ones responsible for implementing the commitments that would be taken at this level. This exercise that we will be engaged in the future must be conducted on a non-selective basis in accordance with international law and the principles set out in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Berbash (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 on behalf of our fraternal Arab countries — Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen — and my own country, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

We have followed with interest the discussions that have taken place over the last few days regarding a draft resolution on the adoption of an international treaty on trade in conventional arms. These discussions have clearly shown that there are still different viewpoints and reservations among many States with respect to the draft resolution. Although we understand the humanitarian objectives and the reasons behind the initiative, we believe that the draft resolution did not take into account a certain number of essential considerations that would help to fine-tune global mechanisms to monitor arms in a way that would be balanced, non-selective and comprehensive, providing for national security, as well as regional and international security for all States under international law.

While we fully respect the international commitments contained in the final document in the first special session on disarmament and the priority that was given in this document to nuclear disarmament in order to achieve general and complete disarmament, we emphasize that any procedures take for control of arms and for transparency that are selective would not guarantee a balanced and comprehensive viewpoint, one that would allow us to implement the commitment of the international community to achieve full and complete disarmament.

This applies particularly to the situation in the Middle East, where Israel continues to occupy Arab territories and possesses sophisticated weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Israel continues to be the only State in the region that is not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It continues to ignore repeated appeals launched by the international community to accede to the NPT and to submit all its nuclear facilities and systems to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) comprehensive safeguards regime.

We support the call for adopting an approach that would garner the support of all Member States of the Organization to discuss the usefulness of coming up with arrangements regarding arms monitoring and to do so with transparency. We believe that any agreement regarding the usefulness of starting negotiations on these mechanisms and measures must be done by means of open-ended negotiations, within the United Nations and open to all Member States.

While we do not support operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which deals with the establishment of a group of governmental experts, we believe that this measure is pre-emptive and that it prejudges operative paragraph 1, which requests that the Secretary-General seek the views of Member States.

If arms control measures are to achieve regional and international peace and security, they must take into account the security concerns of all countries, without any selectivity. If that were guaranteed equally to all States, they would make a real commitment to the implementation of such measures.

I should now like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47 on implementation of the Ottawa Convention on Landmines. My delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution because of our position on the Ottawa Convention, to which we have not yet acceded because it does not take into account our concerns and those of a number of other States that are suffering as a result of such mines. Those concerns were expressed during the meetings of the Preparatory Committee, in which we participated as an observer. Nevertheless, at the national level, my country in coordination with Canada hosted a special mine workshop in Tripoli on 12 May 2005 and established a high-level national body to deal with the problem of mines. A number of United Nations experts on anti-personnel mines also participated in that workshop.

We hope that the concerns that we have expressed will be taken into account in the near future.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We wish to make a brief explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty".

We understand the concern regarding the humanitarian aspects of the issue of the uncontrolled spread of conventional arms throughout the world. We see the illegal arms trade as the heart of the problem. That trade is the main source for illicit armed groups, terrorist organizations, criminal gangs and States and Governments under Security Council embargoes seeking to obtain such weapons.

However, the need for a treaty on the legal arms trade is not obvious. There are already a significant number of arms limitation regimes of various types and in various formats. The issue that we must address is how to implement what we already have. Is there any possibility that we can further strengthen and universalize those instruments in the future?

The draft resolution refers to the field of responsible arms trade. We have several questions: what will the criteria be for a responsible trade, how will one distinguish a responsible trade from an irresponsible trade, and who will do that in practice? That is only one obvious example of how difficult it would be for States to reach agreement on any new universal rules and principles for a legal arms trade.

On many occasions during the preparatory discussions in the First Committee, we expressed our wishes regarding the text of this draft resolution. Unfortunately, most of those comments were not taken into account. We believe that the draft runs counter to the logic in the work on new proposals that has been generally accepted at the United Nations, and elsewhere. We are planning, not just one, but several steps forward at a time when the very advisability of that type of movement has not yet been determined. In other words, we need to obtain information and the views of States regarding the need for a new treaty and the advisability of future steps to be taken in that direction. However, it seems as if matters are being predetermined. We believe that it is unjustified and counterproductive to move forward in that way. Russia is prepared to take into account any proposals made by our partners in future discussions.

Those are some of the concerns that led to our decision to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I am taking the floor to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty".

Unfortunately, we were forced to listen, in the context of the discussion on an arms trade treaty, to a list of baseless allegations against Israel's security policy and its alleged capability. Those accusations have, of course, nothing to do with an arms trade treaty. The countries represented in the discussion that criticized Israel are unwilling to subject their own arms transfers to any standard whatsoever and are encouraging the illicit trafficking of arms to terrorist organizations. Some previous speakers are especially unhappy about Israel's determination to maintain its ability to defend itself.

Israel's self-defence policy is not a source of concern with regard to global peace. There are other real sources of concern in the Middle East. Our policy should also not be a source of concern for countries in our region that do not have aggressive intentions against my country. If countries that do have such intentions are concerned by Israel's ability to defend itself, it should be seen as a contribution to regional stability.

Israel strongly believes in the importance of high and robust standards for arms control. My country is of the view that the implementation of such standards is vital in the struggle against the transfer of arms to terrorists and to countries incapable of providing relevant assurances that such transfers will not take place from the territory under their control. That having been said, we are not yet convinced that an arms trade treaty can facilitate the reaching of such a goal. Moreover, it could, under certain circumstances, hinder the capacity of countries for self-defence and harm legitimate military trade.

Israel's abstention in the voting on this draft resolution should not be perceived as an objection to the very concept of agreed international standardization and strict implementation on this issue.

Mr. Weisleder (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Costa Rica was a sponsor and promoted and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 on an arms trade treaty, as a fundamental step in our ongoing quests as a peaceful country without an army, for peace and social development. My delegation pledges to continue working until this process culminates in a comprehensive treaty.

Mr. Choi Hong-ghi (Republic of Korea): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55. Since we explained our position on this issue during the general debate and the thematic debate on conventional weapons this year, I have no intention of repeating it.

My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, regarding the Ottawa Convention on Landmines.

As we have emphasized on previous occasions, the Republic of Korea fully sympathizes with the spirit and objectives of the Ottawa Convention. We firmly believe that that important Convention plays, and will continue to play, a central role in alleviating the human suffering caused by anti-personnel landmines. However, given the security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are compelled to give priority to our security concerns, and are therefore unable at this point to accede to the Convention. However, we have played a part in the process of regulating anti-personnel landmines, having joined the Convention on Conventional Weapons and its amended Protocol II, in the framework of which we are actively participating in a range of discussions to secure the responsible use of landmines based on a prudent balance between military necessity and humanitarian concerns.

Furthermore, we will continue in our efforts to help those affected by anti-personnel landmines through contributions to the relevant United Nations programmes and United Nations Development Programme Thematic Trust Funds and the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund.

Mr. Qazi (Pakistan): My delegation would like to explain its vote on two draft resolutions under this cluster.

I will start with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Pakistan's position on the question of anti-personnel landmines is well known. Given our security constraints and the need to guard our long borders, which are not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, it is not possible for Pakistan to agree to demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until such a time as viable alternatives are available. My delegation was therefore constrained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

We are against the irresponsible use of landmines. It is that irresponsible use that has caused so much destruction and misery. We remain committed to ensuring the highest standards of responsibility in the use of those defensive weapons. Pakistan is a party to amended Protocol II of the Conventional Weapons Convention, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts, in order to prevent civilians from falling victim to landmines. We are continuing to implement the Protocol with the greatest earnestness.

Pakistan has been actively participating in various international humanitarian demining operations. We have an excellent record on mine clearance in post-conflict situations. The use of anti-personnel landmines by Pakistan is in accordance with international norms. All minefields are marked and monitored to ensure that civilians keep out of mined areas.

I would now like to explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export, and transfer of conventional arms", contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55.

Pakistan has long been at the forefront of efforts to promote the cause of conventional disarmament and arms control, particularly at the regional and subregional levels, so as to advance international and regional peace and security.

Pakistan shares the long-term objectives that the draft resolution sought to achieve. We believe that a comprehensive approach is required to address the complex issue of conventional arms transfers. Emphasis on supply-side prescriptions and disregard of regional particularities does not advance the shared objectives of regulating arms transfers. At the same time, the draft resolution did not address the question of existing imbalances that impact negatively on regional security and are caused by inequitable policies on the part of certain supplying States.

We are convinced that equal attention and effort should be devoted to balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, especially in regions of tension. The overarching aim of any international arms trade framework must be geared towards the reduction of regional and international tensions, the prevention and resolution of conflicts and disputes, the building and enhancing of confidence and the promotion of disarmament, as well as social and economic development.

As agreed at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility to pursue the process of conventional arms reduction.

We share the view that, given the complexity of the issues, a step-by-step approach is essential, on both on substance and process. On substance, the following factors are important: first, promoting the existing mechanism of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms; secondly, addressing both the supply and demand equations of conventional arms transfers; thirdly, further strengthening national controls on transfers; and, fourthly, evolving subregional and/or regional mechanisms, such as the proposal of Pakistan on a strategic restraint regime in South Asia.

With regard to process, we see merit in calls for a sequential approach in dealing with this issue. In the first instance, therefore, the Secretary-General should seek the views of Member States. At the second stage, Member States could decide on the question of establishing a group of governmental experts and thereafter formulate an instrument or instruments on conventional arms transfers.

My delegation had hoped that some of the elements that I have outlined would be reflected in the draft resolution. However, the omission of those important considerations, which could have made the draft resolution more balanced, obliged my delegation to abstain. We will, nonetheless, remain fully engaged in the process of consultations and dialogue on this issue. In order for the dialogue to be successful, it is necessary for it to be inclusive, reflecting diverse views on the subject.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Egypt abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because we believe that the treaty has many gaps. The Convention does not mention the responsibility of States that lay anti-personnel landmines in other countries and fail in their responsibility to eliminate such weapons. We also feel that this draft resolution does not contain appropriate elements referring to assistance to countries affected by anti-personnel mines. Such mines, planted by other countries, have affected Egypt, which has suffered from the presence of 22 million mines planted by warring armies during World War II. That is why we have abstained on this draft resolution.

The Chairperson: I offer my very warm thanks to our interpreters for tonight's job. It was very good of them.

Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to inform members that at our next meeting the Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions listed in Informal Paper No. 2, starting with cluster 6 entitled "Other disarmament measures and international security". We will also take action on four resolutions ready for action in Informal Paper No. 3. These resolutions are A/C.1/61/L.13, Rev.2, L.44, L.54, Rev.1 and L.38.

May I also convey some very sad news this evening. For everyone who has been involved in working on the Programme of Action on Small Arms, Sarah Meek — one of the leading figures in civil society and very involved in developing the Programme of Action — was killed this morning in a car crash in South Africa. We all share in the mourning of this great loss.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/61/PV.22

General Assembly

Sixty-first session

Official Records

First Committee

22nd meeting

Friday, 27 October 2006, at 3 p.m.

New York

Chairperson: Mrs. Juul .... (Norway)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairperson: The Committee will continue to take action on the remaining draft resolutions that appear in informal paper No. 2, starting with cluster 6, namely "Other disarmament measures and international security".

After completing action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, the Committee will then proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, namely "Disarmament machinery", starting with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.12. Once action on those remaining draft resolutions in informal paper No. 2 is concluded, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/61/L.44, contained in cluster 1, and A/C.1/61/L.38, contained in cluster 6 of informal paper No. 3, which was distributed yesterday.

I would like to inform the Committee that at the request of the sponsoring delegations, action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, contained in cluster 1 of informal paper No. 3, has been postponed to our next meeting.

Before proceeding, I would also like to inform members that prior to adjourning today's meeting, I will briefly suspend the meeting so that we may have the certificate awards ceremony for the disarmament fellows.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 6 in informal paper No. 2.

The Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.37. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.37, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th meeting, on 18 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.37 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1-3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.37 was adopted by 158 votes to 1

[Subsequently, the delegations of Haiti and Niger advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery", of informal working paper No. 2.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.12.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.12, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 19th meeting, on 23 October. Sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.12 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1 and 2.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Resolution A/C.1/61/L.12 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 19th meeting, on 23 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.24 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1, 2 and 3.

Madam Chairperson, with your permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

> "Under the terms of operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, the General Assembly would, respectively, 'request[ ] the Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary support to the Regional Centre for better achievements and results' and also 'request[ ] the Secretary-General to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of peace, security and development, and to continue to provide assistance towards stabilizing the financial situation of the Centre'.
>
> "As concerns operative paragraph 5, a provision under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007, covers, among other things, one P-5 post of Director of the Regional Centre at Lomé. The programme activities of the Regional Centre

would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

"The facilitation of cooperation between the Centre and the African Union and the provision of assistance towards stabilizing the financial situation of the Centre as requested in operative paragraph 6 would also be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. Therefore, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and also reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

"Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.24, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Resolution A/C.1/61/L.24 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 19th meeting, on 23 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.28 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1.

Madam Chairperson, with your permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

"Under the terms of operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, the General Assembly would 'request [] the Secretary-General, taking note of paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 49/76 D of 15 December 1994, to provide the Regional Centre with the necessary support, within existing resources, in carrying out its programme of activities' and 'urge [] the Secretary-General to complete, without any further delay, the internal procedure for finalizing the host country agreement and the related memorandum of understanding and to ensure the physical operation of the Regional Centre from Kathmandu within six months of the date of signature of the host country agreement to enable the Centre to function effectively'.

"The implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, Disarmament, of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The provision contained therein covers a P-5 post for the Director of the Regional Centre. The programme of activities of the Centre would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources.

"As concerns operative paragraph 6 regarding the physical operation of the Region Centre for Kathmandu, the Department for Disarmament Affairs would continue consultations with the Government of Nepal. The physical operation of the Centre from Kathmandu would be funded from extra-budgetary resources.

"The attention of the Committee is again drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and also reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

> "Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.28 was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee has now completed taking action on Cluster 7 "Disarmament Machinery".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in informal paper No. 3, cluster 1 on nuclear weapons.

I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to explain the vote before the voting on cluster 1, nuclear weapons.

Mr. Qazi (Pakistan): I have requested the floor to explain the vote before the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of disarmament commitments" contained in document A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

Pakistan supports the objectives of universal and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. In 2004, my delegation appreciated the efforts of the sponsors in revising the contents of the draft resolution to accommodate Pakistan's position. Last year, the decision by the sponsors of the resolution to call for Pakistan's accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) without conditions obliged us to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole and to vote against operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

The history and context of nuclear testing in South Asia is clear. Pakistan was not the first to test. The nuclear testing in South Asia in 1974, followed by further nuclear explosions on 11 and 13 May 1998, disrupted the strategic balance in the region. Pakistan had no choice but to conduct its test to restore strategic stability.

We are disappointed that, this year, the sponsors have chosen to insert discriminatory and selective modifications in operative paragraph 6 by condemning nuclear tests conducted by States that are not yet parties to the NPT. This is yet another example of compromising on principles of objectivity, non-discrimination and fairness. The sponsors are obviously unable to speak the whole truth to power. By doing so, the New Agenda Coalition has undermined its own credibility, as well as the object and purpose of the draft resolution.

In view of the unwarranted and unacceptable changes made in the draft resolution, Pakistan will be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote before the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

India remains committed to the goal of complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We are equally concerned about the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use.

India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to believe that the best and most effective non-proliferation measure would be a credible, time-bound programme for global, verifiable and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

Given the title and core objective of the draft resolution, which seeks a nuclear-weapon-free world, we expected references in it to no-first-use and non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as to the reduction of nuclear dangers through de-alerting, as such steps can constitute important interim measures pending progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons. These and certain other positive proposals contained in the resolution adopted in previous years are not reflected in the draft resolution now placed before us.

Furthermore, we are surprised by the changes between A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/Rev.2, now placed on the table for our consideration. Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 no longer condemns all nuclear weapon tests by States parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), as if for the sponsors it is all right for NPT States parties to have tested and not for States non-party to the NPT. While we perfectly understand the rationale behind the first part of operative paragraph 6 in addressing the nuclear-weapon test conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 9 October, as indeed has been done in two other resolutions we have already adopted in this Committee, a selective and retrospective condemnation of past nuclear weapon tests in the second part of operative paragraph 6 is both misplaced and unnecessary. Also, it may be presumptuous on the part of our Committee to condemn nuclear-weapon tests in the future that may or may not be conducted.

Finally, India cannot accept the call to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Our objections to the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference are well known. In urging India to accede to the NPT promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution negates the rules of customary international law as enshrined in the Law of Treaties of Vienna, which expressly provides that a State's acceptance, ratification or accession to a treaty is based on the principle of free consent. We shall, therefore, be constrained to vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. Kim Kwang Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea opposes operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, since it deals with the nuclear test by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a one-sided and biased manner.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea reiterates its principled position that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will make every possible effort to realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and to promote global nuclear disarmament and the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on cluster 1 of informal paper No. 3, "Nuclear weapons".

The Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 18th meeting, on 20 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and addenda 2 and 3 thereto.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Israel, Pakistan, Togo, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Malawi, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 was adopted by 147 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Togo informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: We will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", which is contained in cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". We will then take action on one draft resolution in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", that is, A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments". None of the other draft resolutions contained in informal paper No. 3 is ready for action at this stage.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44.A recorded vote has been requested.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 10th meeting, on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.44 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and addenda 1 and 3 thereto. In addition, Jordan has become a sponsor.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 was retained by 159 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 as a whole.

I give the floor to the Secretary to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Montenegro, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44 as a whole was adopted by 117 votes to 27, with 26 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Australia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The Chairperson: I will now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". We did so because of our commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Venezuela is firmly convinced that multilateral efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation should be implemented simultaneously and on a non-discriminatory basis, with a view to achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Thus, just as Venezuela rejects nuclear tests, my country believes that the existence of nuclear weapons poses a threat to the survival of humanity. We therefore believe that the only true guarantee against the threat or use of such weapons is their total elimination. International peace and security should not be based on privilege and discrimination, which can only lead to a fragile peace. We therefore appeal for an end to the development of nuclear weapons and for the destruction of those that already exist. We are convinced that the best way of achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world is for all States, without exception, to adhere to the multilateral treaties negotiated in that area and to respect and apply their provisions.

The international community should work tirelessly to ensure the universality of the NPT and the prompt entry into force of the CTBT.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.44, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

We greatly appreciate Malaysia's sincere attitude and firm commitment to the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament, which led it to propose the draft resolution.

Japan believes that, because of the immense power of nuclear weapons to cause destruction and death and injury to human beings, their use is clearly contrary to the fundamental humanitarianism that provides the philosophical foundation of international law. Therefore, we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never be used again, and that continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free from nuclear weapons.

However, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice to which the draft resolution refers clearly demonstrates the complexities of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the International Court of Justice on the existing obligations under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on the matter in good faith. Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to achieve steady, step-by-step progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

In this context, we believe that it is premature to call upon all States — as paragraph 2 of the draft resolution does —

> "immediately to fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons".

We believe that steady, incremental progress should be made prior to our embarking upon the negotiations that all States are called upon to commence under draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44. That is the reason why Japan abstained on the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is the cornerstone of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects and was originally drafted to be in force for 25 years. The 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference decided to extend the Treaty, in a package of agreements and commitments, including, in particular, the obligation of the nuclear-weapon States to make systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons, and the Middle East resolution.

As a follow-up to those disarmament obligations, the 2000 NPT Review Conference agreed by consensus on 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the NPT and paragraphs 3 and 4 (c) of the 1995 decision on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament.

However, 11 years after the indefinite extension of the NPT and 36 years after the Treaty entered into force, the nuclear disarmament obligations have yet to be implemented. The international community has on many occasions expressed its serious concern about the lack of progress by the nuclear-weapon States towards accomplishing the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Serious concerns have also been expressed about the development of new types of nuclear weapons, which is in clear contravention of the undertakings provided by the nuclear-weapon States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty to the effect that the Treaty would prevent the improvement of existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons.

Based on its principled position, the Islamic Republic of Iran fully supports the total elimination of nuclear weapons leading to a nuclear-weapon-free world. In this context, last year my delegation introduced the draft resolution that was adopted as resolution 60/72, which called for follow up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the States parties to the NPT. In our view, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects are mutually reinforcing. The inalienable rights of the States parties to the NPT must also be respected without any discrimination.

The General Assembly, by its resolution 60/72, urged the States parties to the NPT to follow up the implementation of the nuclear disarmament obligations under the Treaty agreed in 1995 and 2000 within the framework of the 2010 NPT Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee. We continue to vigorously pursue this recommendation, and for that reason my delegation also supported draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". We would like to explain our vote in the light of our basic and consistent position on the issue of nuclear disarmament.

China has always stood for the complete prohibition and full destruction of nuclear weapons in order to promote the process of nuclear disarmament. It is our position that, first, an international legal instrument on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons should be concluded at an early date.

Second, nuclear disarmament should be a just and reasonable process of gradual reductions towards a balance at ever-lower levels. The two States possessing the largest nuclear arsenals bear special and primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament. They should comply in good faith with the existing treaties on the reduction of nuclear weapons by further reducing their nuclear arsenals in a verifiable and irreversible manner so as to create conditions for achieving the ultimate goal of complete and thorough nuclear disarmament.

Third, before the goal of complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons is achieved, nuclear-weapon States should commit themselves to the non-first use of nuclear weapons and undertake unconditionally not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Fourth, nuclear-weapon States should abandon policies of nuclear deterrence based on first use of nuclear weapons and should reduce the role of nuclear weapons in national security.

Fifth, nuclear disarmament measures, including intermediate measures, should follow the guidelines of maintaining global strategic balance and stability and undiminished security for all.

Sixth, preventing the weaponization of outer space and an arms race in outer space would be conducive to promoting the process of nuclear disarmament.

Seventh, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva should reach early agreement on its programme of work so as to establish ad hoc committees on nuclear disarmament, security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, a fissile material cut-off and the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and should begin substantive work on those issues.

We endorse the purposes, objectives and major ingredients for promoting nuclear disarmament and achieving a nuclear-weapon-free world at an early date as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, and in draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.32* and A/C.1/61/L.35, adopted previously. At the same we believe that there is room for improvement for all those draft resolutions.

Some of the measures set out in draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", are not feasible for the time being, and we thus have reservations about them. We therefore abstained in the voting on that draft resolution.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.39, "Nuclear disarmament".

Mr. MacLachlan (Australia): I take the floor to explain the Australian delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2. Australia took the decision to abstain in the vote, although we welcome the changes made to this year's draft text. There is much in the draft resolution we support, such as its call on all States to respect their obligations under the

Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its new provision condemning nuclear tests, in particular the nuclear test carried out by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea earlier this month.

However, we continue to have reservations about some elements of the draft resolution. In particular, it continues not to acknowledge the progress already made in reducing nuclear arsenals. We also consider that it is not constructive to list countries in calling for universalization of the Treaty. Australia strongly supports universality for the NPT and continues to urge those yet to join the Treaty to do so as non-nuclear-weapon States. Australia remains actively committed to the objective of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I would like to make a joint explanation of vote for A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". I am speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

This draft resolution contains many elements that are not acceptable to France, the United Kingdom and the United States. The title still does not reflect the progress being made towards nuclear disarmament. The content of the draft resolution does not take due account of a full range of obligations on the part of all States towards nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament or of the most pressing, contemporary challenges to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and global security.

France, the United Kingdom and the United States remain fully committed to meeting our obligations as strictly provided for under article VI of the NPT. We have taken significant measures on nuclear disarmament ourselves and support nuclear weapons reduction worldwide.

Unfortunately, this draft resolution takes account neither of the concrete progress that has been made in this regard nor of the current ongoing efforts undertaken by our three countries. For example, it does not mention the dismantling of fissile nuclear material production facilities for weapons purposes or the reductions of nuclear arsenals, including those pursued under the Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions. Furthermore, this draft resolution does not mention our countries' public commitment, made on several occasions this year, to begin negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty as a matter of high priority.

We are committed to exploring ways to achieve further progress under article VI of the NPT and to strengthen the global non-proliferation regime. We continue to believe that the international community must take responsibility and address the serious current threats posed to peace and security by proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We hope that the ongoing dialogue among States parties will help lead to a future strengthening of the NPT. We are convinced that this draft resolution remains divisive.

Mr. Anton V. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to explain our votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/61/L.44. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.13/Rev.2, we take note of the realistic and well-balanced efforts that have been made. Last year, a number of provisions were withdrawn from a similar draft resolution, but we were still unable to accept. The draft resolution contains a series of very important provisions that we support, but this year, we were unable to change our position, and that is why we abstained. We have some difficulty in accepting the idea of artificially accelerating nuclear disarmament without taking into account the technical, political and financial constraints.

The Russian Federation is strongly devoted to its commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and other nuclear arms reduction agreements. Such commitments are proved through the concrete measures we have taken. We believe that the total elimination of nuclear weapons will be possible only within the framework of a progressive, multi-stage process aimed at attaining that ultimate objective, without artificial acceleration, on the basis of an integrated approach and with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States — an approach that maintains strategic stability and respects the principle of equal security for all. We also believe that there is no reason to refer in the draft resolution — and even to appear to approve of — a number of recommendations made by non-governmental organizations.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44, the reasons that the Russian Federation is not in a position to support that document are known to all and have not changed. However, the way in which we voted on the draft does not mean that we take a negative view of all of its provisions. At the same time, this year's text of the draft resolution covers a number of important new elements on which we wish to state our position.

In principle, the Russian Federation favours the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. That is why we welcome the signing of the Semipalatinsk Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, referred to for the first time in the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.44. The establishment of that new nuclear-weapon-free zone is undoubtedly a genuine success. The Treaty is an important step that will help to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime and will enable us to enhance peace and stability in the region. It will also help to avert the threat of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists.

The Chairperson: As there are no other delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", set out in informal working paper No. 3.

The Committee will first proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote has been requested on paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7 (b) and 9. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 12 October. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.38 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add. 1, 2 and 3 thereto. In addition, Guyana has become a sponsor.

With the Chair's permission, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

> "By operative paragraphs 7 (b) and 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, the General Assembly would, respectively,
>
> '[Request] the Secretary-General, with a view to the three-year cycle regarding review of the Register, to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2009 to review the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development;' and
>
> '[Request] the Secretary-General to implement the recommendations contained in his 2000, 2003 and 2006 reports on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register'.

"Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 7(b) of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the Panel of Governmental Experts would hold three sessions — one in Geneva and two in New York — in 2009.

"The conference servicing requirements for the three sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts in 2009 are estimated to be $562,500 at current rates. In addition, the non-conference servicing requirements have been estimated at $402,170, which include travel of experts and cost of consultant for the substantive servicing of the organizational sessions of the proposed Group of Governmental Experts in 2009.

"Regarding the request contained in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, additional resources to ensure the continuing operation and maintenance of the Register would be required.

"The above requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-20009. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, no additional requirements would arise for the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

> "Once again, the attention of this Committee is drawn to the provision of Section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."

This concludes the oral statement by the Secretary-General.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 140 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Mauritania informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Mauritania informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 139 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38 was retained by 140 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, as a whole, was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

As it did last year on a similar text, Cuba abstained in the vote on this draft resolution as a whole. We also abstained in the separate votes on paragraphs 2, 3, 6 and 9. My country believes that transparency in armaments is an important factor in creating a climate of confidence and in easing tension between States. We consider that the United Nations Register is a concrete measure that can contribute to that goal. For those reasons, Cuba consistently participates in the Register of Conventional Arms and every year sends the relevant information to the Secretary-General.

At the same time, we note with concern the ever-increasing emphasis on including information on small arms and light weapons in the Register, while absolutely no progress is being made in including information about weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons.

We have always stressed the need for the Register to be balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory. The inclusion in the Register of requests for information on weapons of mass destruction and on transfers of equipment and technologies directly linked to the development and production of such weapons would make the Register a more balanced instrument and would facilitate its universality. The Register must not be an end in itself, but rather a means to make progress towards the objective of greater national, regional and international security for all States.

With regard to operative paragraph 9, we feel that the Conference on Disarmament has already concluded its work on transparency. The decision on whether or not to resume consideration of the subject is for the Conference on Disarmament alone to make. Cuba reserves the right to take a final position on this in the Conference. In doing so, it will take into account the need for that body to adopt a balanced programme of work based on the disarmament priorities established by the General Assembly.

I turn now to the groups of experts that have been established every three years to review the Register. Despite the interest that my country expressed in 2005 in becoming a member of the current group, no Cuban expert was included. Although Cuba voted in favour of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, we wish once again to register our concern about the process of deciding on the composition of the group of experts established under resolutions recommended to the Assembly by the First Committee. Both in 2004 and in 2005, Cuba expressed an interest in participating in various such groups. For reasons we do not know, Cuba was not represented in any of these groups, even though we note a certain repetition among the Member States selected from Latin America and the Caribbean. We hope that these points will be duly taken into account by the Secretariat when the composition of future groups of experts is decided.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, as a mechanism for transparency in the field of conventional weapons transfers, can be beneficial in strengthening trust among countries. China attaches great importance to this mechanism and has made active efforts for its establishment, development and continuous improvement.

China first participated in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms regime in 1993. However, starting in 1996, a certain country, in violation of the spirit of the relevant General Assembly resolution and the purposes and principles of the Register, insisted on registering its illicit weapons sales to China's Taiwan province. This action forced China to suspend temporarily its participation in the Register and has made it impossible for China to support resolutions on transparency in armaments in recent years.

China has noted with satisfaction that, with the concerted efforts of all parties, the Group of Governmental Experts on the Register made significant progress this year. The report, agreed by the Group of Experts and submitted to the General Assembly, affirmed, among other things, the important principle that the Register should only include arms transfers among States Members of the United Nations.

We have also noted that the previously mentioned country corrected the disputed practice this year. Accordingly, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on transparency in armaments.

I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that transparency in armaments is of great significance to strengthening international peace and security, but the relationship between the two is not one of simple causality. Transparency in armaments should observe the principle of undiminished security for all and measures to achieve transparency should be reasonable and feasible. Attempts to enforce a uniform level of transparency are inappropriate.

Mr. Qazi (Pakistan): I requested the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments". General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, the first resolution on the issue of transparency in armaments, affirmed that transparency in the field of armaments could reduce the occurrence of dangerous misperceptions about the intentions of States and thereby enhance trust and confidence among them. We agree with that assertion.

According to the same resolution, the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was envisaged as a first step in confidence-building among States. However, 15 years hence, it is clear that the objectives of promoting transparency in armaments remain far from being achieved.

What we have seen in these years is an excessive and destabilizing arms build-up in various parts of the world. We therefore continue to believe that promoting transparency should not become an end in itself. All Member States agreed in the final document of the first Special Session on Disarmament that gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis — in absolute figures or in terms of percentage points — particularly by nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, would contribute to curbing the arms race and would increase the possibility of reallocating resources being used for military purposes to economic and social development. It further reaffirmed that it was possible to achieve reductions in military budgets without affecting the military balance to the detriment of the national security of any State.

These agreed objectives have yet to be translated into action. Earnest and parallel efforts are therefore needed to address the underlying causes that have so far prevented the realization of the objectives of this resolution. In our view, it is important to redouble efforts towards the balanced production of armaments and forces, restraint in the provision and acquisition of destabilizing arms, easing regional and subregional tensions and finding the just resolution of conflicts.

Pakistan has pursued, and will continue to pursue, a comprehensive regime in South Asia, encompassing the elements just outlined.

Mr. Darwish (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I want to explain the vote of the Syrian Arab Republic on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

My delegation would like to confirm its unswerving support for the position adopted by member States of the League of Arab States with regard to the subject of transparency in armaments. My delegation would also like to confirm its total support for a universal approach towards building an international community free of the use or the threat of use of force, a world governed by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, based on justice, equality and peace.

While we confirm our readiness to participate in any international effort designed, with good intentions, to achieve these objectives, we draw the attention of the First Committee to the fact that the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments" does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict persists because Israel continues to occupy Arab territories, refuses to implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and continues to receive, from some major Powers, all kinds of weapons of mass destruction. Not only does Israel have the capacity to develop, produce and stockpile arms, including nuclear weapons, but it also possesses the most advanced conventional weapons.

My delegation would now like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.38, entitled "Transparency in armaments", on behalf of the League of Arab States.

The States members of the League of Arab States would like to reaffirm their position concerning transparency in armaments, in particular in connection with the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

For many years, the members of the League of Arab States have expressed their views on the whole issue of transparency in armaments. The States members of the Arab League believe that it is important to maintain the Register. Their views are clear and well established, and are based on a general approach concerning issues of international disarmament and on a special approach dictated by the distinct character of the situation in the Middle East.

The members of the Arab League support transparency in armaments as a means to strengthen international peace and security. They believe that, if any transparency mechanism is to succeed, it should be guided by certain basic principles and should be balanced, transparent and non-discriminatory. It should strengthen the security of all nations at the national, regional and international levels, in accordance with international law. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms represents the international community's first — albeit long overdue — attempt to address the issue of transparency at the international level.

No one could doubt the potential value of the Register as an international measure to build confidence and as a mechanism for early warning. However, the Register still faces a number of problems, the most important of which is the failure of about half of the States Members of the United Nations to provide information to the Register.

States members of the Arab League believe that it is important to expand the Register, especially given that recent experience proves that the Register, which is limited to seven categories of conventional arms, will not be implemented with universal participation. Many countries, including some States members of the Arab League, are of the view that, because of its present limited scope, the Register does not respond sufficiently to their security needs.

The scope of the Register in the future will, therefore, depend on the desire of the members of the international community to achieve greater transparency and build greater confidence.

Resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, which provided for the establishment of the Register, also provided for its expansion to include information on more sophisticated conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons and state-of-the-art technology with military applications, which would make the Register more balanced and comprehensive and less discriminatory in character and have more participants on a regular basis.

The Middle East region is a special situation, since it is characterized by imbalance in the field of armaments. Confidence-building requires the balanced and comprehensive promotion of transparency. To take a transparent approach to the situation in the Middle East based on the principle of the seven categories of conventional weapons, entirely disregarding the most lethal and sophisticated types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, is neither balanced nor comprehensive. It will not achieve the desired results, especially given that the Register does not take into account the situation prevailing in the Middle East.

Israel's occupation of Arab territories continues, and it still possesses the most lethal weapons of mass destruction. Israel is still the only country in the region that is not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It insists on ignoring the repeated calls by the international community to accede to the NPT and to subject all its nuclear facilities to the comprehensive International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards regime. This prompted member States of the NPT to insist during the review conference in 2000 on the need for Israel to take these steps.

Member States of the Arab League regret that the previous Group of Governmental Experts failed to expand the scope of the Register to include military stocks and acquisitions derived from national production, just as it also failed to include weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons. This runs counter to the provisions of the General Assembly resolution 48/36 L, under which the Register was established.

This failure is a reflection of the failure of the Register and, therefore, of its inability in its present form to be an effective means to build confidence or to be an early warning mechanism. In the light of the above, member States of the Arab League express their reservations on the approach adopted in the draft resolution.

The Chairperson: As I stated earlier, I would like to inform the Committee that the ceremony of presentation of the 2006 United Nations Disarmament Fellowship certificates will now take place. I ask all delegations to remain in their seats for the ceremony in order to congratulate and encourage our junior colleagues. We will suspend the meeting in order to proceed with the ceremony in an informal mode.

The meeting was suspended at 5 p.m. and resumed at 5.20 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

United Nations

A/C.1/61/PV.23

General Assembly

Sixty-first session

Official Records

First Committee

23rd meeting

Monday, 30 October 2006, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairperson: Mrs. Juul . . . . (Norway)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairperson: This afternoon, the Committee will continue to take action on the remaining draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper no. 4, starting with those under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". After completing action on draft resolutions under cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", followed by draft resolutions under clusters 5, 6 and 7.

The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions under cluster 1 in informal working paper no. 4. I first call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolutions under cluster 1.

Mr. Macedo (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

Mexico, as a founding member of the first nuclear-weapon-free zone, which is in a very densely populated area of the world, reiterates its congratulations to and its solidarity with the five countries that decided to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia through the Semipalatinsk Treaty. In the northern hemisphere, that effort joins the effort of Mongolia, which has been declared a nuclear-weapon-free territory. The importance of the Semipalatinsk Treaty cannot be denied. We hope that it will be followed by similar initiatives, particularly in the northern hemisphere.

Our experience in Latin America and the Caribbean has thus made us fully aware that building a nuclear-weapon-free zone takes time and requires the commitment of all the nuclear Powers and the support of the international community. In that connection, we hope that the remaining obstacles can be gradually overcome.

Mexico encourages the Governments of Central Asia to continue their efforts and expresses its readiness to work together to promote better cooperation and coordination among the nuclear-weapon-free zones. For Mexico, such zones represent not an end in themselves, but a means to attain the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament. That is why my delegation will support the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

Mr. Toledo (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", which welcomes the signing of the Semipalatinsk Treaty on 8 September 2006. More than 40 years have passed since the signing of the treaty establishing the world's first nuclear-weapon-free zone, in Latin America. Moreover, it is important to recall that the creation of that zone in the 1960s took place in

---

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

a very difficult period in our history. With political will, it was possible to make it a reality through the efforts of all interested parties.

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, freely entered into, reflects the right of any independent State to determine the best living conditions for its population. Therefore, not to support this draft resolution would be not to recognize the right of every State to determine its own way to live in harmony with the international community. That is why my country's delegation appeals to countries harbouring any doubts to support this draft resolution, in the conviction that every State has the sovereign right and power to negotiate as needed in order to establish peace and security in its region.

Thus, for those reasons, my country's delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. Apolinar Espinal (Dominican Republic) (*spoke in Spanish*): First, we should like to congratulate you, Madam, on your excellent work in guiding the work of the First Committee. We have taken the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

The Dominican Republic, as a country that is committed to international peace and security and that believes that disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are essential elements in achieving those goals, values the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone by the countries of Central Asia. We consider this to be a resolute and important step towards the objective of complete nuclear disarmament. As a State party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which established the first nuclear-weapon-free zone, in Latin America and the Caribbean, we encourage other countries to follow the example of Central Asia. For that reason, we will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

The Republic of Venezuela supports efforts to strengthen international peace and security that have as a priority the total elimination of nuclear weapons as well as their non-proliferation. We believe that one of the most effective ways to achieve those objectives is the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreements freely entered into among States.

For that reason, our country is a party to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean — the Treaty of Tlatelolco — an instrument that established the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in an inhabited region of the world. In that context, we congratulate Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan on the signing, last September in Semipalatinsk, of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, the first such zone in the northern hemisphere. We wish to express our support for draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, which was submitted by those five Central Asian countries.

Venezuela believes that that initiative will significantly contribute to efforts to achieve the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons and of nuclear non-proliferation. At the same time, we would like to underline the need for nuclear-weapon States to provide to all States in nuclear-weapon-free zones unconditional guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", because our country fully supports the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia and views it as a positive step towards achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament.

At the Havana Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement in September, the heads of State and Government of the countries of the Movement welcomed with satisfaction the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia at Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan and considered the establishment of the zone as an effective contribution to the strengthening of regional and international peace and security.

The Summit also reiterated the fact that it is vital, in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, that nuclear-weapon States provide all States in the zone with unconditional guarantees against the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Cuba welcomes the willingness expressed by the signatories to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia to continue consultations with nuclear-weapon States on certain provisions of that legal instrument. We hope that the nuclear-weapon States will participate in good faith in that consultation process, so that the zone can be established as soon as possible.

The Chairperson: Are there any other delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting? If not, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee".

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 10th meeting, held on 10 October 2006. The sponsor of the draft is indicated in the document.

I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1.

> "Under the terms of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, the General Assembly would:
>
>> '[Take] note of the decision of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, following appropriate consultations, to hold the first session of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna from 30 April to 11 May 2007'; and
>>
>> '[Request] the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee'.
>
> "Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that Secretariat assistance and substantive support services to the 2010 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee would be required for its implementation.

"Conference-servicing costs of the first session of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna, including the provision of summary records for five plenary meetings, are estimated at $704,835. In addition, non-conference-servicing requirements for travel of substantive staff from the Department for Disarmament Affairs, general temporary assistance, overtime, communications and miscellaneous expenses are estimated at $34,200.

"In accordance with established procedures, the United Nations would levy a charge at a rate of 13 per cent of expenditures for such activities, to defray the administrative and other support costs incurred in their implementation. Such expenses are estimated at $96,075. Furthermore, in accordance with established policies and procedures in the United Nations, a provision corresponding to 15 per cent of the estimated costs of the meeting would have to be made for a contingency reserve to cover eventual shortfalls and final expenditures. This would amount to $110,855.

"In order to ensure that the convening of the session in Vienna would not result in additional costs for the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Government of Austria has indicated its readiness to cover the additional costs of holding the meeting in Vienna, instead of New York, which are estimated at approximately $56,816.

"A decision on the dates and venues for holding further sessions of the Preparatory Committee and on the Review Conference is expected to be finalized by the parties at the first session of the Preparatory Committee, together with a number of other decisions on organizational arrangements, including the provision of five summary records.

"All costs related to the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee shall be met in accordance with the arrangements made by the parties to the Treaty. The request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the 2010 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee, should thus have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for the 2010 Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee for the approval of the States parties.

"It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. These activities would be undertaken by the Secretariat after sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties.

"In this connection, the Secretary-General advises that all final assessments which are outstanding for previous Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty and its Preparatory Committee should be remitted by the States parties to the Secretariat as soon as possible. Further, the application of credits of the States parties from previous Review Conferences to the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee would be carried forward only when the outstanding balances have been remitted.

"In summary, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Pakistan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted by 163 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Uzbekistan at the Committee's

18th meeting, on 20 October 2006. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1 was adopted by 128 votes to 3, with 36 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to make a few remarks on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia". I am making these remarks on behalf of the delegations of the following eight countries, all of which voted in favour of this draft resolution: Austria, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland and Japan.

The text of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia was signed on 8 September 2006 in Semipalatinsk by the five Central Asian States. Our eight delegations regard the signing of that text as an effort to strengthen peace and stability in the region and as a contribution to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Such a zone would be the first regional nuclear-weapon-free zone in the northern hemisphere and would encompass an area in which nuclear weapons previously existed.

As stipulated in the principles and guidelines of the 1999 report of the Disarmament Commission (A/54/42), it is important that the five nuclear-weapon States be consulted during the negotiations on each treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone. That facilitates their signature to and ratification of the protocol relevant to such a treaty. In that regard, we take note of the expressed readiness of the five Central Asian States to continue consultations on a number of the Treaty's provisions. We will pay close attention to such future consultations among the States directly concerned, as outlined in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution before us. That forward-looking approach is an important element towards the future role of the Treaty: the strengthening of peace and stability in the region.

Finally, we would like to encourage the five Central Asian States to keep countries with an interest in this process informed about the developments related to their consultations.

Mr. Taalas (Finland): The European Union warmly welcomes the selection of Vienna as the venue for the first Preparatory Committee meeting of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The invitation was issued to mark the special occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Thus, we regard Vienna as an exceptional venue for hosting the first Preparatory Committee meeting. The European Union considers that that is not a precedent for future review cycles of the NPT.

I would like to thank the Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations for conducting the consultations with great care and patience.

Mr. Landman (Netherlands): I have the honour to speak on behalf of 12 States Members of the United Nations. Together with the Netherlands, the delegations of Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Romania and Turkey abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

We attach great importance to nuclear-weapon-free zones for peace and security on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among the States of the region concerned. Our countries have consistently expressed their support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. Therefore, we welcome in principle the initiative of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan aimed at establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

We fully support the efforts being made to pursue a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. However, the conclusion of the Treaty without finalization of the consultations with the five nuclear-weapon States has resulted in a Treaty that does not formally establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone as set out in Article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We therefore consider it essential that outstanding issues concerning this nuclear-weapon-free zone as referred to in, and in accordance with, operative paragraph 2 of the resolution, should be resolved. Further consultations in accordance with the United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines are therefore necessary.

Mr. Csörsz (Austria): Speaking on resolution A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1, Austria wishes to align itself with and support the statement delivered previously by Finland on behalf of the European Union.

Austria warmly welcomes the selection of Vienna as the venue for the first Preparatory Committee of the review cycle for the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to be held in spring 2007.

The Austrian Government has extended this invitation to mark the special occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Thus, Austria regards the holding of the Preparatory Committee in Vienna to be exceptional in view of this auspicious occasion. Austria understands that this situation does not set a precedent for future review cycles of the NPT.

Austria is grateful to all delegations for having favourably considered this invitation and for having agreed on the venue. In particular, my delegation would like to commend Brazil, sponsor and coordinator of the draft resolution, for its efforts.

Madam Chairperson, Austria is looking forward to welcoming you and all delegates to Vienna next spring and is confident that the stage will be set for substantial discussions to take place in a fruitful and optimistic spirit.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. China's position on nuclear-weapon-free zones has been consistent and clear. We respect and support the efforts of the States in the region to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone on the basis of consultations and agreement freely reached by the States concerned, taking into consideration the reality of the region. We also believe that the establishment of such a zone is in the interest of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament and that it will contribute to the peace, security and stability of the region in question.

China has signed and ratified the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty and the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, as well as the relevant protocols. China has also reached a consensus with the Asian States for the Treaty on the South-east Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone and looks forward to its opening for signature at an early date.

China enjoys traditionally friendly and cooperative relationships with the five Central Asian States. We highly value and actively support the efforts of these States in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia and welcome the fact that the five States have agreed on and signed the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty. China will, as always, continue to support the efforts by States in other regions to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. Meyer (Canada): I have asked for the floor to explain Canada's decision to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1. Canada strongly supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We consider these to be important contributions both to nuclear disarmament and to nuclear non-proliferation. They are valuable measures for enhancing international security.

In the particular case of Central Asia, we are also very much in favour of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone there. As the first such zone located entirely in the northern hemisphere, and one which includes a State, Kazakhstan, which renounced possession of nuclear weapons and joined the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State, a Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone will be a welcome addition to similar zones that have already been established, in Latin America, Africa, South-East Asia and the South Pacific. It will also set a clear example for other regions where nuclear weapons have been stationed in the past to follow in the future.

Canada believes, however, that some more work is needed before this laudable enterprise can be fully realized.

Article 12 of the Semipalatinsk Treaty has raised concerns about the impact of pre-existing security arrangements on the Treaty and its core purpose. This ambiguity has prompted Canada's abstention at this time.

On the other hand, the process of resolving this question seems to be relatively straightforward, and the States of the region are ready to pursue further negotiations with the interested parties to this end. We thus very much hope that a solution can be arrived at expeditiously and count on the goodwill of all involved to make this happen.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I take the floor to give an explanation of the Israeli vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

Israel is naturally sympathetic to the concept of mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zones that are freely arrived at among all the States of that region. Still, we believe that other States that have legitimate security concerns pertinent to a particular zone should also preferably be engaged in order to enhance the efficacy of such arrangements.

In addition, on the normative level, we consider it highly advisable that resolutions related to zones free of nuclear weapons under discussion in international forums should strive for a consensus among all the relevant sides. Such a consensus can only reinforce the prospects of achieving such a zone.

In the absence of a consensus, Israel decided to abstain on this resolution.

Mr. Trezza (Italy): This is an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev. 1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia". Italy subscribes to the reference to nuclear-weapon-free zones made by the European Union presidency in paragraph 25 of its statement to the First Committee on 10 October of this year. We recall article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which states that nothing in that treaty affects the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to assure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories.

We also acknowledge the importance of nuclear-weapon-free zones for peace and security on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among States of the region concerned. In this spirit, we welcome the decision of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to establish a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia. We encourage those States to continue consultations on the Treaty signed at Semipalatinsk and on article 1 of its protocol.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I would like to make a joint explanation of vote on resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1 on the Central Asian nuclear-weapons-free zone treaty. I am speaking on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States have been in touch with the five Central Asian States on a number of occasions, expressing our concern over the inadequacy of consultations in the development of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. Ever since the December 2002 consultations at the United Nations between the five Central Asian States and the five Permanent Members of the Security Council, we have made known our availability for further consultations. We put substantive questions to the five Central Asian States during the 2002 consultations. We resubmitted those questions in writing on 8 November 2005, and raised them again before the signing of the Treaty on 8 September this year. The answers to these questions are key to allowing us to resolve outstanding issues and arrive at a mutually satisfactory outcome.

Our primary reservation concerning this new treaty remains with regard to article 12, which indicates that existing treaty obligations of the States party would not be affected by this new Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. We have never been given a satisfactory rationale for this article. The provisions of this new treaty must take precedence over any pre-existing treaty obligations that would fundamentally undermine its objective; otherwise, this treaty would have little meaning.

By signing the Treaty, the five Central Asian States have frozen the text and made future adjustments to it much more difficult. We would have preferred them not to have submitted a draft resolution to First Committee before we were able to resolve these issues.

For these reasons, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States are not in a position to endorse the Treaty signed on 8 September, nor can we adhere to any protocol based upon it. Our delegations therefore have had to vote "no" on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1. Nevertheless, we continue to stand ready to consult with them in order to arrive at a mutually satisfactory outcome.

Mr. MacLachlan (Australia): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

Australia is a strong supporter of nuclear-weapons-free zones freely arrived at by Member States. Australia has previously supported the consensus adoption of a resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia.

The agreement on a Central Asian nuclear-weapons-free zone was only very recently signed and, as we have just heard, we are aware that some countries have significant reservations about the final text of the agreement. In these circumstances, Australia does not believe it would be prudent to support this resolution, until we have had the opportunity to study fully all aspects of the agreement.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Spanish delegation would like to express its agreement with the explanation of vote that has just been given by the delegation of the Netherlands after the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

Spain fully supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone on the basis of arrangements freely entered into between the States of the region concerned. Spain has always expressed its unequivocal support for the objectives of the treaties establishing a nuclear-weapons-free zone, as it believes that these zones are an important contribution to international peace and security, the strengthening of nuclear non-proliferation regime and also efforts conducive to nuclear disarmament.

Spain has consistently expressed its support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia. Therefore, Spain welcomes and supports the initiative and efforts of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan towards establishing a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Asia.

However, the conclusion of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone in Central Asia, without finalization of the consultations with the nuclear-weapon States, has resulted in a treaty that does not formally establish a nuclear-weapons-free zone as set out in article VII of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the 1999 United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines on nuclear-weapons-free zones.

Therefore, Spain deems it essential that the outstanding issues concerning this nuclear-weapons-free zone — as referred to and in accordance with operational paragraph 2 of the draft resolution — are resolved through further consultations and in accordance with the guidelines of the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Denot Medeiros (Brazil): I wish to take this opportunity to explain the "yes" vote of Brazil on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

As a State party to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean and a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", adopted last week by this Committee, Brazil is fully convinced that nuclear-weapons-free zone treaties, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, contribute to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects and contribute to the process of general and complete disarmament. They are measures that deserve the full support of the international community.

We therefore welcome the signature in Semipalatinsk, Kazakhstan of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1. We hope that the General Assembly will be able, at an early date, not only to note, but indeed to welcome the actual establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. For this purpose, we encourage the nuclear-weapon States to continue to engage in good-faith consultations with the Central Asian countries on the provisions of the Treaty.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.21/Rev.1. My delegation has abstained on the resolution in line with our known position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Pakistan subscribes to the objectives of the NPT, although it is a non-NPT nuclear-weapon State. We are already fulfilling the NPT's non-proliferation norms. Pakistan is prepared to continue to act in consonance with the general obligations in this regard. Because of the realities on the ground, we cannot, however, be expected to adhere to that treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

Despite this limitation we recognize the important contributions made by the successive NPT Review Conferences to address the issues of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. However, the current disarmament and non-proliferation regime is facing challenges to which we have drawn attention in our statement in this Committee. We sincerely hope that the next NPT Review Conference will explore ways to normalize the relationship between NPT and non-NPT nuclear-weapon States to make the NPT a living treaty, which is responsive to the realities of today.

Mr. Brasack (Germany): I have requested the floor to explain the vote of Germany, which abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

In principle, Germany was ready to vote, as some of our European Union (EU) partners did, in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", as a signal of support for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a contribution to regional and global peace and security and as a means to promote nuclear disarmament, stability and confidence. It appeared important to us to give a signal of encouragement, particularly as concerns the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

Nevertheless, we share the concerns and views expressed earlier this afternoon by the delegation of the Netherlands on behalf of 12 countries. In the end, we decided to abstain in the voting to show our disappointment at the fact that suggestions that could have helped to bridge the existing differences between the parties concerned were, unfortunately, not taken into account by the sponsors of the draft resolution. Those suggestions would have provided a perspective for further joint efforts to make the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia internationally recognized, including by the three nuclear-weapon States.

As a consequence, we feel that the current revised text does not reflect the balance we had hoped for. Under these circumstances, we do not see ourselves in a position, at this juncture, to support draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1. We hope that in the coming 12 months, efforts by all sides concerned will be undertaken to allow all parties concerned accession to the protocol of the Semipalatinsk Treaty.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): I am taking the floor in explanation of vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

The delegation of Egypt expresses its support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia and congratulates the Central Asian republics on the successful signing of the Treaty on 8 September 2006 in Semipalatinsk. At the same time, we express our appreciation for the readiness they have shown to continue consultations with the nuclear-weapon States leading towards the strengthening of the zone.

Egypt continues to support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world as an important measure towards achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects, as well as to pave the way towards the achievement of regional and global peace and security.

We hope that we will witness the establishment, as soon as possible, in the Middle East, in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions as well as the 1995 resolution on the Middle East of the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), of such a zone, thereby strengthening efforts to preserve the NPT and paving the way towards the achievement of a lasting and comprehensive peace in the region of the Middle East.

For all those reasons, we have supported the draft resolution.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): I am taking the floor to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. We welcome the decision of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. We had hoped, however, that the draft resolution could be further strengthened to provide a strong signal on the importance of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

I recall that, at the signing of the Semipalatinsk Treaty, the Foreign Minister of Kazakhstan stated, among other things, that the "countries of our region declared a firm commitment to the principles of disarmament and non-proliferation". This is in line with the agreed United Nations principle that the establishment of zones free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction should be done on the basis of freely arrived at mutual agreement among the States of the region concerned and constitute an important disarmament measure.

My delegation believes that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone is a positive step and an important measure towards the strengthening of global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. That is why, at the recent Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, held at Havana last September, Indonesia, along with the 117 countries of the Non-Aligned Movement that are also Members of the United Nations, welcomed the signing in Semipalatinsk of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia. We consider the establishment of such a zone an effective contribution to the strengthening of regional and global peace and security.

Finally, in accordance with the guidelines on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1996, it is up to the States in the region concerned to decide on the terms governing the zone, and it is the prerogative of the nuclear-weapon States to choose whether or not to offer further assurances to their members in the form of protocols on the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty.

Mr. Anton V. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I am taking the floor to explain the vote of the Russian Federation on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.54/Rev.1.

We congratulate Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan on the successful completion of the years of work that led to the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, which we welcome.

The establishment of that zone represents an important step towards the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime at a time when such a regime is facing certain challenges. The Semipalatinsk Treaty will no doubt help to strengthen peace, security and stability in the region. It is significant, in this context, in terms of averting the threat of a nuclear weapon falling into the hands of international terrorists.

The Treaty is the result of lengthy, intensive and complex negotiations and consultations. We wish to underline in particular the significant contributions made by United Nations representatives and by the

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to the extensive preparatory work that was carried out with respect to the States of Central Asia.

In elaborating the Treaty, full account was taken of lessons learned from experiences in creating similar zones as well as all existing recommendations and regional characteristics. As was the case with other, similar zones, questions relating to the granting of security assurances and safeguards by individual nuclear-weapon States can be resolved fully during consultations using existing legal and other instruments. This is a standard practice that has been used in similar circumstances by Russia with respect to other zones. We would like to note the willingness of the participating States in Central Asia to consult further on the protocol to the Treaty. Here, of course, good sense and goodwill will be very important.

The Central Asian States have once again demonstrated a positive approach to dialogue here in the First Committee in preparing the text of the draft resolution.

Now that the Semipalatinsk Treaty has been signed, we have the task of ensuring its practical implementation. Russia will do its utmost to help in this process. We call upon all States to do likewise.

The Chairperson: If no other representative wishes to speak in explanation of vote or position after the voting under cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, "Conventional Weapons".

I give the floor to the representative of Mali.

Mr. Mallé (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I would like to make a minor technical revision in draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

Preambular paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should read:

> "*Taking note* of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, adopted in 2005[3]".

In addition, the words "See also decision 60/519" should be added at the end of footnote 3.

The Chairperson: If no delegation wishes to make a general statement or to speak in explanation of vote before the vote under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali on behalf of the Economic Community of West African States at the 16th meeting, on 18 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.25 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1, 2 and 3. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mozambique, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Slovenia, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and Zambia.

The representative of Mali has just introduced an oral revision relating to the sixth preambular paragraph, which now reads:

(*spoke in French*)

> "*Taking note* of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, adopted in 2005[3]".

(*spoke in English*)

Footnote 3 now includes the words

(*spoke in French*)

"See also decision 60/519".

(*spoke in English*)

With your permission, Madam, I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

> "Under the terms of operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, the General Assembly would
>
> > '[Invite] the Secretary-General and those States and organizations that are in a position to do so to continue to provide assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them'.
>
> "The activities that would be required to implement the provisions of the resolution would be financed from available extrabudgetary resources. Therefore, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.25, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 7.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.26 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1 and 3.

The Committee will first take a vote on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, United States of America.

Operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26 was retained by 163 votes to 2.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus", as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Japan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, as a whole, was adopted by 164 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairperson: The floor is now open to those delegations wishing to explain their vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". Japan, like other Member States, attaches great importance to resolving the problem of ammunition, which is inseparable from the issue of conventional weapons. It is thus Japan's belief that we should continue in-depth discussions and exchanges of views among Member States in order to adequately address the problem through the concerted efforts of the entire international community.

In our view, however, the discussions at the regional and global levels so far have not developed sufficiently for the international community to be able to share a common understanding of the matter. In the current situation, Japan is of the view that the establishment of the proposed group of governmental experts on ammunition would still be premature.

In that connection, I would like to draw the special attention of all Member States and the Department for Disarmament Affairs secretariat to Japan's concerns about the expansion of the United Nations budget. As Japan has stated on many occasions, it cannot accept that the uncontrolled expansion of the United Nations budget. With regard to groups of governmental experts, we believe that we should look very closely at their value and usefulness beforehand, and that their establishment should be restricted to cases where they can be expected to have real value, taking into consideration the necessity of healthy management of the United Nations budget and making maximum use of the scrapping and building of existing United Nations programmes. Japan will continue to pay close attention to this issue in the future.

Mr. Méndez (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.26, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". We wish nevertheless to note that it is for each State to determine when the accumulation of ammunition would be excessive. We also believe that the question of the illicit trafficking of ammunition is closely linked to the illicit trafficking of arms; the marking of ammunition is thus a very important aspect which could help prevent their diversion to illicit activities.

We believe the Governments of the countries with the main arms industries bear primary responsibility to adopt regulations to make it possible to bring about the marking of ammunition before export in order for them to be properly traced.

With reference to operative paragraph 7, our delegation believes that at this stage, it would have been better to complete the process of gathering the opinions of Member States, which would have made it possible to exchange points of view in order to determine the course of action to be followed in this matter.

The Chairperson: We shall proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security". I call first on those delegations wishing to make general statements on draft resolutions in cluster 5.

Mr. Dzundev (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): I would like to make a technical revision to the text of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1. The final portion of the eighth preambular paragraph should read as follows:

> "opening of the negotiations for a stabilization and association agreement with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, as well as resuming stabilization and association agreement negotiations with Serbia, pending full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia,".

Mr. Taalas (Finland): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union. I would like to put on record that the oral revision just read out constitutes a factual correction and that the European Union fully supports it.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 18th meeting of the Committee, on 20 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1-4. In addition, Canada, Luxembourg and the United States of America have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has just introduced an oral revision to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. The revised eighth preambular paragraph should therefore read as follows,

> "Noting the progress made by the countries of the region, including those of the Stabilization and Association Process, in fulfilling the criteria for membership in the European Union and, in this context, the start of the accession negotiations of Croatia and Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia becoming a candidate country for membership in the European Union, the signing of the Stabilization and Association Agreement with Albania and the opening of the negotiations for a stabilization and association agreement with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, as well as resuming stabilization and association agreement negotiations with Serbia, pending full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia".

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.46/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairperson: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

I call first on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. Taalas (Finland): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) regarding draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth disarmament decade". The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Montenegro and Serbia, and the EFTA countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova align themselves with this declaration.

The European Union has decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1. The EU is a staunch supporter of effective multilateral action in the field of arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament, as expressed in our Security Strategy, our Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and other EU instruments. We wish to contribute to the development of a stronger international community, well-functioning international institutions and a rules-based international order. This entails strengthening the United Nations and equipping it to fulfil its responsibility to act effectively.

We also believe it important that the work done by the global disarmament machinery effectively address the challenges before it. We attach great importance to the revitalization of the First Committee, among other things by reducing the number of draft resolutions submitted and by making them more operational.

We would like to recall that we support draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament" which will be adopted by the Committee at its current session and the aim of which is to mobilize the attention of the international community in the field of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation.

The European Union appreciates the intentions and the constructive spirit of the proposal by Sierra Leone, but remains to be convinced of the added value of the General Assembly at this session setting the agenda for the Disarmament Commission session in 2009.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth disarmament decade", because we share and support the objectives of the text. The draft resolution's submission is timely, because its adoption will allow enough time to begin a proper process of preparation with a view to the declaration of a fourth disarmament decade starting in 2010. We all know well the difficult and complex situation that prevails in the sphere of disarmament and international security.

In the opinion of Cuba, the declaration of a fourth disarmament decade could make a positive contribution to mobilizing international efforts to emerge from the current stagnation and move forward towards the disarmament objectives to which we are all committed. The declaration of a fourth disarmament decade would also be a step forward in promoting multilateralism as a basic principle of negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation in all their aspects, and in the light of the dangerous tendency on the part of some States to resort to unilateralism with increasing frequency.

The Chairperson: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth disarmament decade", was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 18 October 2006. The sponsor of the draft resolution is named in document A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab

Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 51 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I give the floor to the representative of Switzerland, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Quattrini (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Declaration of a fourth disarmament decade". Switzerland is aware of the difficulties faced by international arms control and disarmament negotiating forums. However, my delegation believes that the stalemates do not necessarily result from the existing structures, but rather from the lack of will of States to take part in negotiations because of their differing priorities.

Although my delegation appreciates the spirit and intentions of the Sierra Leone initiative, we are not convinced of its usefulness in the current context. Furthermore, Switzerland already supports the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". From that perspective, my delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.17/Rev.1 runs counter to the objectives we set for ourselves two years ago with respect to revitalizing the First Committee.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I call first on the representative of Indonesia, who wishes to make a general statement on this cluster.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): I wish to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and to make a statement before the action on cluster 7. In the general debate of the First Committee, many delegations and groups of delegations have expressed their disappointment in the failure of major conferences in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation during the past year. In his statement, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs also recounted those setbacks. Many also reaffirmed the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation and were determined to promote multilateralism as an essential way to develop arms regulations and disarmament negotiations.

The cumulative effect of the negative developments has been the continuation of the nuclear arms race. There are plans for creating a new generation of nuclear weapons. We are also facing the distinct danger that terrorists will acquire those weapons, with potentially calamitous consequences. Concurrently, efforts to advance conventional weapons continue unabated in many parts of the world.

In the Final Document (resolution S-10/2) adopted by consensus at the conclusion of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, whose thirtieth anniversary we will be commemorating in 2008, we stated, inter alia, that while the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is the elimination of the danger of nuclear weapons.

In spite of the best efforts of the international community, adequate results have not been produced with the existing disarmament machinery. There is an urgent need for the machinery and forums appropriately constituted for disarmament deliberations and negotiations to be revitalized. Therefore, the role and responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, in accordance with the Charter, must be strengthened.

Against that summary backdrop, with the adoption, without a vote, of resolution 59/71 in 2004, we have the responsibility to fulfil the mandate entrusted to us by the General Assembly. In that context, we believe that the substantive sessions of the Open-ended Working Group are the appropriate forum to make adequate preparations towards the convening of a fourth special session on disarmament. In 2003, a comprehensive set of proposals were submitted by the Non-Aligned Movement, the European Union and others during the sessions of the Open-ended Working Group. Those proposals were built based on the experiences of the past, as well as on existing disarmament agreements and the global norms that have served us so well. They also contained several new issues related to disarmament and international security.

We believe that the substantive sessions of the new open-ended working group will provide each Member State with an opportunity to make contributions to our common objectives and to share the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We remain confident that we will have a productive and effective exchange of views on relevant disarmament and non-proliferation issues. That will facilitate our quest for ways and means to ensure common security based on a balanced and comprehensive set of interests among all groups of States.

In that respect, the Non-Aligned Movement expresses its readiness to work closely and constructively with all Member States to fully utilize the forthcoming substantive sessions of the open-ended working group, which will be mandated to consider the objectives and the agenda of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, including the establishment of its preparatory committee. The Movement urges all delegations to provide their continued support, in fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to us by resolution 59/71 of 2004, which was adopted by consensus.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 19th meeting, on 23 October 2006. The sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/61/L.4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San

Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Tonga.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.4 was adopted by 166 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Tonga advised the Secretariat that it had intended not to participate in the voting.]

The Chairperson: The Committee has thus concluded the third stage of its work, action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under disarmament and international security items.

Agenda item 110

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

The Chairperson: In connection with this item, I should like to refer delegations to document A/C.1/61/1 — specifically, to the explanation contained in its paragraph 18, which reads as follows:

> "The General Assembly decided to allocate item 110 also to all the Main Committees for the sole purpose of considering and taking action on their respective tentative programmes of work."

A draft proposed programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2007, as contained in document A/C.1/61/CRP.6, was previously circulated to all delegations for their consideration. However, a revised document, A/C.1/61/CRP.6/Rev.1, was circulated this afternoon. The document was revised owing to the fact that the dates of the official United Nations holidays in 2007 have now been issued, including the date for Eid al-Fitr, which will be 12 October 2007. Consequently, that is reflected in document A/C.1/61/CRP.6/Rev.1. Thus, the Committee will have at its disposal a total of nine meetings, instead of 10, for thematic discussions and the introduction of draft resolutions. That is the only change in the document.

Following my consultation with the Chairman of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee), it has been agreed that both the First and Fourth Committees will begin their work during the first week as they have always done in the past, that is, in a sequential manner. However, the Fourth Committee has once again agreed to allow our Committee to hold both morning and afternoon meetings on Monday and Tuesday of the second week, which begins on 8 October. This draft programme will, of course, be finalized and issued in its final form before the Committee begins its substantive work at its next session.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft programme of work and timetable for its next session, as contained in document A/C.1/61/CRP.6/Rev.1?

It was so decided.

Statement by the Chairperson

The Chairperson: Before I adjourn this meeting, allow me to make a brief statement in my capacity as Chairperson of the First Committee.

During this session of the First Committee, several delegations have drawn our attention to the many setbacks and problems that we have experienced in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation in recent years. But, as I said in my opening statement four weeks ago, the issues we are dealing with are of such fundamental importance that there is no alternative to trying harder, despite the obstacles and difficulties that we have to face.

In assessing this year's session of the First Committee, I note that there continues to be room for improvement as regards the repetitive nature of our work. But I think it is being gradually acknowledged that a resolution remains valid until it is replaced by another resolution on the same subject matter - and that does not need to happen every year.

Nonetheless, I also note that new, and very relevant, issues were introduced this year, including the question of a possible international arms trade treaty. This is healthy for our work.

From the outset, I was determined to continue the process of improving the working methods of the Committee. I think that we have made some progress. In the United Nations, time is a costly commodity, but we have been able to utilize our allocated time better than in previous years. Delegations, by and large, respected my decision to start the meetings as scheduled, at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m., respectively. Some delays were unavoidable. However, that was not due to bad organization of our work, but rather resulted from the fact that delegations took greater interest in participating in the debates than anticipated. That is good news.

I think that the cluster approach to our debates proved valuable indeed. But we can do even better. Occasionally, the debates became fragmented and overlapped. This is an organizational challenge which I believe we can overcome. The Secretariat represents our collective memory, and I know that it will assist next year's Chairperson in rectifying the problems that we have identified this year.

The participation of experts and high-level officials from our arms control instruments also improved the quality of this year's debates in the Committee. Some adjustments will be needed in the future so as to ensure an optimal interactive dialogue between experts, officials and delegates.

Civil society contributed fruitfully to our deliberations on 19 October. I am pleased that delegations took considerable interest in exchanging views with non-governmental organizations on issues related both to nuclear weapons and to conventional arms.

In conclusion, I consider this year's session of the First Committee to have been a reasonably successful one. When we commenced our work, I asked members for their cooperation, and they certainly delivered. I do, indeed, appreciate that. Many representatives will now return to arms control diplomacy in other forums. I wish them all the best, and hope that they found at least some inspiration in this year's First Committee session.

Allow me also at this stage to express my sincere appreciation to all members of the Committee for the cooperation that they have extended to me throughout this session. It has certainly been a great privilege for me to work with all of them. I also thank all delegations for their full cooperation and support in utilizing the time and facilities allocated to the First Committee in a truly efficient manner. It is my firm belief that the First Committee has again set the benchmark for all other Committees to follow in terms of its effective management of time and efficient use of conference facilities, particularly in connection with the use of the rolling list of speakers for the general debate and the interactive discussions that the Committee held.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my fellow Bureau members: the three Vice-Chairpersons, Mr. Andy Rachmianto of Indonesia, Mr. Federico Perazza of Uruguay and Mr. Boštjan Malovrh of Slovenia, and our Rapporteur, Mr. Abdelhamid Gharbi of Tunisia. Their collective wisdom and experience were instrumental in allowing me to effectively discharge my functions as Chairperson.

Allow me also, on behalf of the Committee, to offer my profound gratitude to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Tanaka, for the support that he and his staff from the Department for Disarmament Affairs have provided. On behalf of the Committee, I would also like to convey my heartfelt thanks to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Jarmo Sareva, and all of his colleagues in the First Committee secretariat, for all of their tireless efforts throughout the past month.

My sincere appreciation goes also to all the interpreters, translators, record keepers, press officers, document officers, conference officers and sound engineers, who have been diligently working behind the scenes in order to support the Committee's work.

As I stated earlier during the session, the Committee will reconvene next year, some time in June, to elect its Chairman for the sixty-second session.

I give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Allow me, first of all, to extend our gratitude and appreciation to you, Madam, for your able and effective leadership in steering the work of the First Committee. Your chairmanship marks a historic milestone in the work of the Committee, as you are the first woman ever to preside over the Committee. We would also like to commend you for continuing the measures taken by your predecessors to improve the effectiveness of the methods of work of the Committee.

The Non-Aligned Movement continues to believe that the rationalization of the work of the Committee is a process and that it should be continued in a transparent and comprehensive manner. We hope that it will be retained and further developed in forthcoming sessions of the Committee.

We have noted that more States participated in the Committee's general and thematic debates than in previous years. Formulating a work programme for the Committee that includes panel discussions with independent experts and non-governmental organizations is something that needs to be maintained and further developed. We see these developments as a positive indication of the growing relevance to Member States of the role and function of the First Committee.

As in previous years, the Non-Aligned Movement demonstrated a constructive and positive outlook by submitting six draft resolutions for the consideration of the Committee. Those draft resolutions received overwhelming support from member States, and some were even adopted without a vote. In this regard, the Movement would like to express its appreciation and gratitude to all of the delegations that supported those draft resolutions.

Let me also to take this opportunity, through you, Madam, to express our appreciation to the members of the Bureau, and to the Secretary of the Committee and his staff, for all of their hard work and assistance during our session.

Finally, the Non-Aligned Movement remains committed to promoting international peace and security, primarily through disarmament measures. We strongly believe that multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions, in accordance with the Charter, remain the only sustainable way to address disarmament and international security issues. It is our hope that multilateralism, within the framework of the United Nations, will provide much-needed impetus for moving the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda forward in our endeavours next year.

The Chairperson: I give the floor to the representative of Finland.

Mr. Taalas (Finland): Now that the First Committee has completed this stage of its work, the presidency of the European Union would also like to take this opportunity to say a few words of thanks.

First and foremost, we would like to thank you, our Chairperson Ambassador Mona Juul, for your dignified, skilled and punctual performance in carrying out your tasks. We also thank your dedicated team. As the first female to chair the Committee in living memory, your success is an argument for the continued appointment of women to positions of leadership. *Tusen takk* — a thousand thanks.

The European Union would also like to express its appreciation for the work of the Secretariat, both the Secretary of the First Committee and his team and the members of the Department for Disarmament Affairs. The efficiency and skill of the Secretariat has much facilitated our work this year.

The Chairperson: I thank the representatives of Indonesia and Finland for the kind words addressed to all of us.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.